

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_87824
Title of the Manuscript:	Some Formulae For Integer Sums Of Two Squares
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:

(<https://www.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>Comments about Proposition 2.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1) It is necessary to make clear that $b > a$. Otherwise, the reader will assume that a, b are random numbers.2) Simplest proof is to put in equality in place of b: $b = a + 2$. There is no need to prove it using two cases. The reader is not allowed to find more easy way to prove the identity. If you want to present the proof with two cases, mention that in the end.3) The equality you present is not an equation (example of equation: $2x - 1 = 0$). This you present is equality of identity.4) Low reading interest identity for someone. In maths there is always the possibility to be useful sometime in the future. Because of this, the article is accepted. <p>Comments about Proposition 2.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1) It is necessary to make clear that $c > b > a$.2) Simplest proof: $b = a + 2$, $c = b + 2 = a + 4$. No need for two cases.3) Not equation. Equality or identity.4) Low reading interest identity for someone. <p>Comments about Proposition 2.3:</p> <p>The same comments used above.</p> <p>Comments about Proposition 2.4:</p> <p>The same comments used above.</p>	The Reviewers comments are genuine and addressed.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Comments about Proposition 2.5:</p> <p>The same comments used above.</p> <p>Comments about Proposition 2.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1) This is not equation. It is equality or identity.2) Simplest proof if you put in place of b: $b = a + 4$ and put in place of c: $c = b + 4 = a + 4 + 4 = a + 8$. No need for two cases. If you want to present the proof of two cases, mention that in the end.3) Low reading interest identity.	Very helpful observation
Optional/General comments		I am pleased by the good work of the reviewer to improve the documents

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