



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14869
Title of the Manuscript:	Model Estimation and Error Level for Okike's Merged Irregular Transposition Cipher
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper should start with brief introduction of the problem statement (identify the gap in your research.), your methodology of solving these problem, then you brief a compression of your work and others work (why you think your model is better than others models in literature) in terms of efficiency, robustness and level of security. Finally some results you have obtained in your work. Keywords I didn't see any relevancy between the keywords and the paper contents. As an example I did not see encryption, decryption keyword while it is relevant works. In line 136 you left with 3 spaces while in line 138 you left with 5 spaces Why?!! Need more explanation. What is the complexity of your model? Compare with other models. Possible attacks to your method and how to resists? should be explained	The reversed paper has taken care of the problem statement in the introduction. The relevant keywords have been added. See reversed manuscript for the more explanation. The complexity of the model depends on swapping the positions of the separate encrypted individual messages.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Conclusion should reflect whatever has been discussed in the papers, and should be complete. Two lines are not enough. Referees should be the most recent published papers related to the proposed method. And should be research papers, books, technical reports, and should be more than 5.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		