



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_42834
Title of the Manuscript:	Acceleration of Biological Sequence Alignment Using Residue Number System
Type of the Article	Short 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>)

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	- Section "Methodology" should be more detailed. The information are not connected. Then it is difficult to understand the real contribution of the work. - In Section "Performance Evaluation" the quality of the equation's image is poor. It is difficult to understand the numbers described. - Section "Results and Discussion" is extremely poor. It must be more detailed.	Thanks for your observations. 1. The methodology section has been improved in detail as rightly observed. 2. Performance evaluation section: the equation graphics has been corrected. However, it is best displayed in office 2010. 3. Results and discussion section has also been improved further.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- There some words that are not usual for a manuscript (scientific). The author(s) should revise the English concerning technical language.	Checked and edited.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- The results of the work seem to be interesting. However, the must be better presented.	Thanks for taken out of your valuable time to review my article; indeed, I respect all your observations.