

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_101670
Title of the Manuscript:	ULBC: An Ultra Light-weight Block Cipher
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)
<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>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1 The importance of this article is determined by the fact that with the massive spread of the Internet of things, the protection of data and access to them is a key point in their use. Various cryptotechniques are used for this purpose. This article discusses this issue and draws useful conclusions. 2 The title of the article is quite correct. 3 The abstract reveals the content of the article. 4 The article is perfectly structured and formatted in accordance with the accepted standards of scientific publication. 5 From the point of view of mathematics, no errors were found. The science is quite convincing. 6 References to literary sources are sufficient.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Good Language	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>Petr Mikhailovich Korolev</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Russia</b>