



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_24367
Title of the Manuscript:	AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONGRUENCE $1 \bmod 24$ AS A GENERATOR OF PRIME NUMBERS GREATER OR EQUAL TO 5.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The author studies an interesting theme. However, it seems that his results are essentially based on the main results from [21]. Moreover, the proof seems to be incomplete: (lines 115-116, the case $n = 2k$ is missing; consequently, the corresponding table might be missing too; in this case, the second parenthesis from above is an even number). Also, at page 3 (lines 69-70), the fifth computational equality, and lines 82-83, "... = 2 + 6[..." are not clear and seem to be useless for further results.	Lines 115-116 the case $n = 2k$. There is not variable n, it is not missing. The poof is to find an integer m. The line 115 is $1 + 12t + 36t^2 = 1 + 24m$ and the line 116 is: $t(1 + 3t) = 2m$ Line 69-70.... And line 82-83 This is important, because it is necessary to proof that $(pq)^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{24}$. The process is correct considering the two cases for $(m + n)$ either odd or even. In both cases it shows that always $(pq)^2$ is 1 mod 24..
Minor REVISION comments	Delete the point after the Title. Line 28: after . Line 40: "Let... be integers...". Please use " Proof " instead of "Demonstration". Line 93: delete the second "now". Line 102: who is n ? (n is used, but not defined); is it m ? Line 110: delete the second comma. Line 112: "... if $t = 2k$, ...". Line 113: "... let p be a...". Line 115: the case $s = 2k$ is missing? Lines 139, 142: " If $a \in \mathbb{N}$, ..., then..."	Line 28 it is de proof of Euler. Line 40 I put be . I put Proof instead of demonstration. Line 93. There is not "now". Line 102. n is defined in lines 99-100 for p_i primes, $p_i \geq 5$, $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, Line 110, there is not second comma. Line 112: I put if . Line 113: I did de correction. Line 115: We include $s = 2k$ to proof that $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Line 139, 142. I change let for if
Optional/General comments		