

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_118609
Title of the Manuscript:	On Unitary Quasi-Equivalence and w-Hyponormal Operators In Hilbert Spaces
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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Saint-Louis, le 17 juin 2024 DR. ESSOZIMNA KPIZIM Email:kpizimessozimna@gmail.com Title : On Unitary Quasi-Equivalence and w-Hyponormal Operators In Hilbert Spaces Comments of Essozimna KPIZIM In this manuscript, the authors have investigated the On Unitary Quasi-Equivalence and w-Hyponormal Operators In Hilbert Spaces. This manuscript is easy to understand for experts in the field, but not for all researchers, because not much information is quoted. However, it is a minor extension of this theory. The following comments will help in the improvement of the manuscript's quality :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Standardize fonts for document writing Review the abstract, because the history of unitary quasi-equivalence must not in the abstract, then, the paragraph "The concept of unitary quasi-equivalence was introduced in 1996 under the idea of nearly equivalent operators. Since then, various researchers have explored its properties on different operators in Hilbert space. For instance, it has been shown to preserve the binormality, normality, isometry, co-isometry, partial isometry, and hyponormality properties of an operator. It has also been shown to be symmetric, transitive, and reflexive, thus forming an equivalence relation. However, the properties of unitary quasi-equivalence on the class of w-hyponormal operators have not been shown."should be moved to the introduction. On that note, the summary must be rewritten in its entirety, because the problem isn't really clear in the summary. The motivation of this paper should be further strengthened, and the main contributions should be pointed out precisely. Where are the preliminary ? First page "." before the quoted reference ([1]). The introduction is not motivation and don't have the structure of this paper. Definition 2.1 is not necessary, as it is a commonly known definition. Proof these inclusions or give the reference to those proof $Hyponormal \subset Log-hyponormal \subset w-Hyponormal \subset Paranormal \subset K-paranormal$ $Hyponormal \subset p-Hyponormal(0 < p < 1) \subset w-Hyponormal \subset Paranormal \subset K-paranormal$ Where is the proof of Lemma 3.1 ? if it's not your Lemma, give the reference. Given the exemples if possible of the methodology. Cite more recent references after 2020 and avoid older references from 1990 or 2018. What is the difference between the Quasi-Equivalence shown by PR. Halmos [6] and that of your Manuscript? What is the advantage of your Quasi-Equivalence? Justify and add a remark. A comparative study with other related work is critical to qualify the superiority, novelty, originality, and clarity of this paper. <p>Conclusion : I accept this paper entitled "On Unitary Quasi-Equivalence and w-Hyponormal Operators In Hilbert Spaces" for publication in the journal "Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science" on condition that the authors take into account the comments I have suggested in order to improve</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	the clarity of the document. I will be happy to check the final paper for improvements before publication.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Essozimna Kpizim
Department, University & Country	Gaston Berger University of Saint-Louis, Senegal