

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMCS_96848</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Centralizer of a dhotrix of size 3 over a GCD domain</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes. The calculations are correct and the subject may be of interest. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. It is appropriate. But I recommend composing the introduction, for example; commenting in a bit more detail on applications and noting that the main result is Theorem 3.1. 5. Yes. 6. Yes. I recommend writing all bibliographies in the same format (see attached file). It is important to compose the introduction so that the work looks more attractive. Point out in the introduction that the main result is Theorem 3.1, and also put general "things" of its importance. I recommend putting at least two examples that illustrate Theorem 3.1.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Suitable. In addition, specific observations are found in the attached file.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Authors should point out which results are true for the characteristic of field F is zero or positive, this may confuse the reader.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Fausto Jarquín Zárate</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México</b>