



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_50977
Title of the Manuscript:	On nonsingularity of RSFPLR circulant matrices
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:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This paper discusses the nonsingularity of a row skew first-plus-last right (RSFPLR) circulant matrices with the first row (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n), which is determined by entries of the first row. The sufficient condition for the matrix to be nonsingular is described in detail, and other sufficient conditions are derived for judging the nonsingularity of the matrix. Overall, the content of this paper gives an important result in the topic concerned. However, the presentation of the paper shall be further improved. Some comments are given as follow.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Page 2, see "it is a FLS r-circulant matrix", what does "FLS" stand for? Please define. 2. In Page 2, see "A = " on the top of the page, this equation shall be labelled as Equation (1.1), and the following equation is labelled as (1.2) and so on. 3. In Page 2, Section 2, see "Let $A = \text{RSFPLRcircfr}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ be a RSFPLR circulant matrix", this sentence is repeated from the sentence in Definition 1.1, and it can be deleted. 4. Do not have Corollary 2.1, Corollary 2.4. Why? 5. Do not have Theorem 2.2, Theorem 2.3, Theorem 2.4, Theorem 2.5, Theorem 2.6, Theorem 2.7, Theorem 2.9. Why? 6. Do not have the proof for Corollary 2.3, Corollary 2.6, Corollary 2.7. Shall those proofs be given? 7. There are some grammatical mistakes, please do the correction carefully. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Sie Long Kek
Department, University & Country	Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Malaysia