

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_49769
Title of the Manuscript:	Cell Arrangement Method for Solving Systems of Linear equations in Three unknown
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agree highlight that part in the mar his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The author compared two known model for solving a systems of Linear equations in three unknowns. The cell arrangement, and the cofactor ad joint model. He claimed from his finding, that cell arrangement is less time consuming to cofactor ad joint model. But his claims are not full reflection of the title non the purpose as in line; 35,36. The title should reflect the body or content of the paper. If possible, change the title to 'Comparison of cell arrangement and Cofactor Ad joint model for solving systems of Linear Equations'. Abstract; Should be rewritten as one paragraph to reflect the objective of the paper, methodology, findings conclusion and recommendation. Remove the subtitled in the Abstract Line; 12 Adjoint be written as Ad joint Line; 25 the unknown, be written as unknowns Line; 25 the unknown were, should be was The author should please read through the paper so as to correct mistake and re arrange the paper for good reading. Line 133 and Line 225 should be merge as results and discussion.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Although the paper did not add to the existing known knowledge of solving Linear equations, it should be accepted for publication after the corrections but be tempted as Review paper	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed w that part in the manuscript. It is i feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight mandatory that authors should write his/her





SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ebiendele Ebosele Peter
Department, University & Country	Lagos State University, Nigeria