



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_21918
Title of the Manuscript:	Matrix Inverse as by-product of Determinant
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Though the main results are correct, the application background and the meaning of this paper are not stated clearly. If some practical application examples are listed, this paper is of great meaning. Besides, the authors do not review or conclude the former research results in introduction, which is little more than froth.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Besides quote of the references is too simple. There are some grammar mistakes in writing, which should be checked up. Here I only list few of them: (1) In Abstract: insert "that" after "It follows as the by-product" since there are two predicate verb. (2) In Abstract: "fail" should be "failing". (3) the professional notation of a matrix is suggested to be "M", and its inverse be " M^{-1} ", and so on	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Jianchao Bai</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Xi'an Jiaotong University, China</i>