

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_116921
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Generalization of the Number of Cyclic Codes Over the Prime Field GF(37)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses gaps in existing research on cyclic codes over finite fields, particularly focusing on $GF(37)$ which has not been characterized before. The study provides valuable insights into abstract algebraic concepts in coding theory and offers a generalized enumeration of cyclic codes, which can have practical applications in error correction coding. 2. The title of the article, "Generalization of Enumeration of Cyclic Codes over $GF(37)$," is suitable as it accurately reflects the main focus of the study and provides a clear indication of the content. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It succinctly summarizes the background, objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications of the study. It effectively communicates the significance of the research and the contributions made by the authors. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate. The study follows a logical flow, starting with background information on cyclic codes and cyclotomic polynomials, presenting the methodology, discussing the findings, and concluding with implications and future directions. 5. Based on the information provided in the abstract, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The methodology employed for generalizing the enumeration of cyclic codes over $GF(37)$ seems sound, and the conclusions drawn from the analysis are logical and consistent with the objectives of the study. 6. The references provided seem sufficient for the scope of the study, and they include relevant sources to support the theoretical framework and previous research in the field. 	
<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 language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communication. However, a comprehensive assessment of the language quality would require a thorough review of the full manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The contents of this paper adhere to the objectives and criteria established by the Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science.</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:	Dang Vo Phuc
Department, University & Country	FPT University, Vietnam