



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_22064
Title of the Manuscript:	A twin prime analog of Goldbach's conjecture
Type of the Article	Short communication

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Is the major contribution of this article is confirming a published conclusion? The authors should briefly describe the major contribution of this article in the abstract. 2. Why two pairs (10, 52) and (30, 32) are twin ranks? I think readers of this article will have difficulty to figure out the reasons from the definition in Section 2 of this article. More explanations are needed, although this article was classified as a short communication. 3. Provide some examples to illustrate corollaries 1 and 2.	1. The abstract was amended to reflect its major contribution, i.e. conjecture no. 1. 2. A clear explanation was provided in the text. 3. An elementary proof was provided for the two corollaries. The examples were considered superfluous.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Eqs. (1) and (2) seem to contain mis-typed letters. Please check these equations. 2. Eq. (4) seems to contain mis-typed letters. Please check this equation.	1. The equations were amended to be more in line with the conventional notation.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	NA	