

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_114693
Title of the Manuscript:	On Construction Structures of Matrix Solutions of Linear (or Exponential) Diophantine Equations
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diophantine equation is a classical problem in mathematics, the authors study matrix form of the equation, which is somehow interesting. However, the authors only provide some sufficient solutions but not provide any discussion on necessity. In other words, it will be better if the authors can discuss the whole solution space. 2. No. I do not understand why the authors use “linear” in the title. 3. No. It is too short and not cover the main idea of the article. 4. No. The paper is bad organized. Some issues are listed as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 In Section 1, the authors claim that Theorem 1.1 is only main result of the paper. However, there are some other results, see Section 3 and Section 4. 4.2 Page 4, the examples is the same idea with “Proof of Theorem 1.1” with $q=2$, $n = 6$, it is not necessary to have an example here, or it should be after the proof. 4.3 5. Yes. Most of the computations are quite basic for one familiar with matrix computations. 6. Yes. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The paper is badly written. I list some of the issues as follows (not all of them).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some of the variables are not in mathematical style. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Page 1, Paragraph1, “a and b”. 2. Page 2, Paragraph 1 from the bottom, “The index defines the number of non-zero complex coefficients of the matrix different to 1 and 0”, remove “and 0”. 3. There are two equations in eq.(2.1)? 4. Definition 2.4 is not a definition, it looks like a propose. 5. Page 3, Paragraph 1 from the bottom, “...the matrix B admin...”. The same paragraph, “... a positive integer m such that B^m a Rare matrix of order...”->“... a positive integer m such that B^m is a Rare matrix of order...” 6. Most of matrix can be written in a smaller size, not all the elements are necessary to be shown. 7. Page 8, “In particular, where q and n are prime number.” is not a complete sentence. 8. Page 8, “Proof of Theorem 1.1”, “A_{α}” should be “$A_{\alpha + 1}$”. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest to reject the publication of this paper.</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:	Lincong Fang
Department, University & Country	School of Information, Zhejiang University of Finance and Economics, China