



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_49643
Title of the Manuscript:	Proof of Collatz conjecture
Type of the Article	Original research

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Reference such as wikipedia is not sufficient. There were at least 30 publications in https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collatz_conjecture , from where literature and references can be taken after reading through the papers. -Cross reference for Collatz conjecture is required to add value to the work.	1. Done. And read the remark added in the conclusion. 2. Direct cross reference for Collatz conjecture does not exist as Collatz himself did not write it. See Lagarias, Jeffrey C. (1985), The $3x+1$ problem and its generalizations. The American Mathematical Monthly Vol. 92 No. 1 (Jan., 1985), pp. 3-23 https://www.jstor.org/stable/2322189?origin=crossref&seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents third alinea of introduction beginning with "The exact origin".
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No.