

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_112734
Title of the Manuscript:	Computing the minimum polynomial, the function and the Drazin inverse of a matrix with Matlab
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

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>1. I think that every manuscript intended for scientific dissemination should have its publication encouraged. Although it is a work with a very basic approach (didactic, with characteristics typical of scientific dissemination, rather than being an actual scientific work), I see here a well-intentioned work that deserves such publicity, if this is the aim of this journal.</p> <p>2. Yes. It is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes. It is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes. The division is very harmonious. The paper as a whole is very well written and organized. However, it is necessary to add a concluding chapter, reporting the objectives achieved and possible future developments for the paper.</p> <p>5. Naturally, it is not possible to verify all the calculations, all the mathematical developments in a short period of time. But the general structure suggests correct work.</p> <p>6. Commenting on references is sometimes a little difficult as you don't always get access to all of them. I consider 16 references a large number for a paper of such modest scope, but I believe that the authors have more authority to report which works were actually necessary in their research. Regarding the dates of the references, this is not important in a work of pure mathematics</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English is not my native language, so I have some difficulties with deeper issues associated with your grammar. But I believe that the text is on the same level of understanding as other academic works with which I am usually in contact.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>As mentioned previously, it is necessary to add a concluding chapter, without which this work cannot be considered complete. Mathematical formulas should, as is customary, be numbered.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonardo Simal Moreira
Department, University & Country	UniFOA – Centro Universitário de Volta Redonda, Brazil