

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_120606
Title of the Manuscript:	HYPERCYCLICITY CRITERION ON BASIC ELEMENTARY OPERATOR
Type of the 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://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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	➤ Hypercyclicity criterion has been an important tool in the test of hypercyclicity of different operators.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	➤ No, I suggest that: HYPERCYCLICITY CRITERION IN SEBRABLE HELBERT SPACE.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	➤ Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No, because absent sections of preliminary. ➤ Question of paper should be in introduction ➤ Keyword should be at least 3 words. ➤ Number of pages at least 10 papers 	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The scientific correctness of this manuscript in terms of languages , its good. ➤ Yes, manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	➤ Yes, the references sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	➤ Yes	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Simon Joseph
Department, University & Country	University of Bahr El- Ghazal, South Sudan