



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_33315
Title of the Manuscript:	THE PROPOSITIONAL LATTICE OF DIVISIBILITY AND BEAL'S CONJECTURE
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Suggest adding some reviews of published studies similar to this article. 2. This manuscript doesn't provide any result section. It is difficult to judge the contribution of this article. Suggest adding some examples.	1. Unfortunately, there are no similar studies or reviews regarding applications of logical modal in proving mathematical conjectures. I can only suggest to the reviewer a previously published work in this journal (though not directly concern the subject of present manuscript): An Example of the Application of Provability Logic to Unsolved Problems in Number Theory: The Cullen Numbers and Conway's Supposition http://www.sciencedomain.org/abstract/15662 2. According to reviewer's suggestion, the revised version of the manuscript has the explicit closing remarks.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The journal's name of Reference [5] may be abbreviated.	According to bibliography style accepted in most scientific journals, authors should avoid any uncommon abbreviation of journal names, books, publishing houses etc.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	NA	The author would like to thank the reviewer for his time and consideration.