

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_103600
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-excedance on the -non Deranged Permutations
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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript examines an interesting statistic (anti-excedance) on a specific type of permutation (non-deranged), which provides some new insights. However, the significance and importance of this work for the broader scientific community could be made clearer in the introduction. Overall, it seems like a technically sound study, but additional motivation is needed to highlight its value.</p> <p>The title is accurate but seems bit technical. Consider a title that better conveys the key findings or contributions, such as "Connections Between Anti-Excedance and Excedance Statistics on Non-Deranged Permutations"</p> <p>The abstract provides a high-level summary but could be enhanced to more clearly state the key results and their significance.</p> <p>The structure of sections seems appropriate, but the flow and transitions between them could be improved. More explanatory details in the results would also help.</p> <p>From my assessment, the mathematical derivations seem scientifically valid.</p> <p>The references cover previous work in this area, but are a bit dated. Including some more recent related papers would strengthen the literature review. Specific suggestions depend on availability, but works in the last 5 years would be ideal.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that need to be corrected. For example, in the abstract "This was done first through some computation on this scheme using prime numbers[]" is unclear. • Some sentences are long and complex. It would be helpful to break these up into shorter, simpler sentences for clarity. • The tone is very technical and formal. While this is expected for a scholarly paper, adding some more explanation and context would make it more engaging to read. • There are some typos/inconsistencies in notation that need to be fixed (e.g. both $\omega(i)$ and ω_i used). • The structure and organization could be improved to have a more logical flow. Transitions between ideas are sometimes abrupt. <p>Overall, the technical content seems sound</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ankur Kumar Shukla
Department, University & Country	India