



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_47241
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Insolubility of the 4-th Hilbert Problem
Type of the Article	

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Abstract should not be written in paragraphs. It should be one paragraph and summarizing the whole work. I recommend that you remove the unnecessary illustrations in brackets for they are well known e.g non-isometry(non-preservation of length) . The title should be revised to read: ON NEW GEOMETRIES RELATED TO EUCLIDEAN GEOMETRIES AND THE INSOLVABILITY OF 4-TH HILBERT'S PROBLEM. Provide a section for the survey of the Geometries related to Lobachevski's Geometry and a section for Results/Findings. The results in the document are well discussed but they need to be more organized in form of Propositions and Theorems The paper MUST be proof-read thoroughly to avoid simple typos and spelling mistakes. This will enhance likeability and readability. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I propose that the paper be written in LateX format for proper output. Some symbols are not well behaved when written in ms word. Page 9: $\alpha \in \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ should be written as $\alpha \in (-\infty, +\infty)$. Check through the document for consistence. Explain Fig 2. Pg 9 into details. Provide the DOI s of all the references used. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper is ok. Having very good results. These results should be made easier to see by the reader. Avoid a lot of stories when formulating results. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michael Onyango Ojiema
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya