

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_92844
Title of the Manuscript:	On the minimum polynomial and applications
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/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	As per my opinion, researchers have taken relevant topic for the study. But before the publication, following points must be addressed by the researchers: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Title of the paper should explain the text of the paper. 2. Author starts the Abstract with "In this note" is not so much appropriate. It must be replace with something like "In this study or paper/article" or what so ever. 3. No Literature Review is given by the author. 4. Author needs to describe the requirements of the said research work, why he select or start this research should be given in the 'Introduction part'. 5. Author should distinguish the contribution made by him. 6. Author should be explain the solution methodology 7. Finally there is no conclusion and future extension idea. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract and Introduction both are not in order it look like a work assignment may re-write them. 2. In Abstract author mentioned that "it is closely related with the computation of the Drazin generalized inverse of A", but author do not put any remark in the study about this. 	
Optional/General comments	The Author has tried to cover the topic in very vast form. All these area may also be studied separately.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vinod Kumar
Department, University & Country	Om Sterling Global University, India