

**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_45010
Title of the Manuscript:	A NEW AND SIMPLE MATRIX INVERSION METHOD USING DODGSON'S CONDENSATION
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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>This article furnishes a new and simple matrix inversion method, which makes full use of the condensation technique of the author of Alice in Wonderland, Charles Dodgson. A special feature of this article is the adoption of Bhaskara's law of impending operation on zero in overcoming the problem of division by zero whenever zero appears as a divisor in the condensation technique of Dodgson.</p> <p>In my opinion, the paper is well written and organized. The work of the paper is correct. However, there are some comments to improve the quality of the paper which are given as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the introduction part, the author should give more background works in details about advantages of the proposed method over the existing methods• Some remarks on the computation complexity of the obtained results should be given.• In Figures, further explanations should be provided about the different coordinate systems. Please make sure that the parameters in all figures are explained.• In order to show the efficiency of the proposed method, comparison with similar works may be pointed out in the simulation part in detail.	Background works and other suggestions have been considered in the corrected paper.
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	