



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_22319
Title of the Manuscript:	FAST AND SECURE MODULAR MATRIX BASED DIGITAL SIGNATURE
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	Paper needs revision. Many things and terms are not clear like in line 62,110. The length of research paper is too long. It can be reduced very easily.	In line 62 (new notation -66) contains explicit recording of matrix in the form of a string of four numbers, namely, the first row of the matrix provides first and second elements of the number string, and the second row of the matrix provides the third and fourth elements of the number string. I do not see any reason to repeat it once more the addition of the specified text, the more that it would be contrary to other reviewers' comments about length of paper. In line 110 (new notation -114) bit string s is the hash value of the concatenation of two bit strings, which are explained in the subsequent four lines. The length of the article text is due to my desire to make it as understandable to the reader, but any reduction in it can trigger new questions, the answers to which will lead to a further increase in the length of the text.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		