SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJMCS_19380**
Title of the Manuscript:	**On the DAG Decomposition**
Type of the Article	**Research 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	**N. A**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Some of the articles in the reference list have not been cited in the article. (See [1], [7], [11], [16], [18-21], [23] in the reference list. It will be nice if the necessary articles are properly cited in the articles and others may be excluded from the reference list. 2. Some notations used in the paper differ from the notations in the common usage. For example, authors use $d_{out}(v)$ for the outdegree of a digraph. But the common and popular notation for the same is $d^{+}(v)$. It will be better if the authors use popular notations. 3. Please use ''if and only if" in all places wherever authors wrote ïff".	
Optional/General comments	The article is a well-written article. Good language. The concepts and algorithms are explained well with the help of graphs and examples. The content of this article is correct, worthy and interesting. Hence,	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sudev Naduvath**
Department, University & Country	**Department of Mathematics, Vidya Academy of Science & Technology, Kerala, India**