

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_126625
Title of the Manuscript:	Computational Aspects Of Determinant And Inverse Of Tridiagonal Toeplitz Matrix
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article, is good for research in mathematics, especially linear algebra. The Tridiagonal Toeplitz matrix can be used in many applications. Although this article, is good, it is not strong enough and does not provide strong and important knowledge in linear algebra, because there are some previous studies that presented methods similar to the method studied in this topic, as the author mentioned in the introduction.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. But I suggest the deletion of some points in this section, such as in the two row of abstract: "...based on the journal written by [1]", delete " the journal written by"	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, I think the title of some sections needs to change. Such as section (2), I suggest it changes from "Previous Research" to "Preliminaries", because the previous research mentioned in the introduction. Also, with respect to the sections numbering, I suggest putting full stop in front of the number of each section, like: 1. Introduction, and so on for other sections.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The method used in this article is good. The reader can understand it easily, then he can apply it in many applications. The author depended on the original rule in linear algebra for the determinant and the inverse of the matrix. The results were true.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, but some sentences need to be modified.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some symbols in the article are not known, so they must be defined, such as the symbol of the real numbers, integers and naturals. 2. Putting full stop at the end of complete sentences, and commas between some sentences. 3. The first word after the equation (2.2) starts with the capital letter: "From" 4. I suggest the subsection (3.1) changes to: The Determinant of The Tridiagonal Toeplitz Matrix, and the subsection (3.2) to: The Inverse of The Tridiagonal Toeplitz Matrix. 5. Rewritten some sentences such as in pages 6, 7 and 8. In page 4 the row 6 "so that" does not give good meaning. 6. Some words need to put "the" and "a" front it. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asmaa Mohammed Kanan
Department, University & Country	Libya