Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMCS_126347**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Research on properties of zero points and poles of K-bianalytic functions**
Type of the Article	**Original research**

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

Review Form 3

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Complex analysis plays an interesting role in many mathematical disciplines. The concept K-analysis functions which is a generalization of analytic functions. This scientific study can use in the development of Geometric Function Theory of extended concepts and properties analytic and geometric properties.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Not suitable** The suitable title of the article is: **"On properties of zero points and poles of K-bianalytic functions"**	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It should be improved abstract The authors should be written more details about the zero arc and poles results	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Its suitable	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically correct but not scientifically robust because it needs some effective examples bout zero arc and poles. Moreover, the introduction of this article should be improved by mentioning the recent previous studies. In addition, robust motivations for this study should be written. The authors should provide some examples and explain the role these examples in developing the complex analysis	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Need some recent references For example 1- Juan Lin and Yongzhi Xu, Riemann problem of (λ, k) bi-analytic functions, Applicable Analysis An International Journal, 101, 2022, 3804-3815 https://doi.org/10.1080/00036811.2021.1987417	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Its suitable	
Optional/General 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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Hiba Fawzi Al-Jannabi**
Department, University & Country	**University of Baghdad, Iraq**