SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_43728**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A comparison of Two Novel Methods for Handling a Certain Class of Problems of Digital Circuit Design**
Type of the Article	**ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER**

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	In this manuscript, author gives a comparison between the method of Boolean-equation solving and the method of input-domain constraining for claiming their superiority over old method. In the manuscript, author already raised the question "Why should we bother revisit a problem that was really hot as back as half a century ago?" and this is a serious one. To address this, 1) Add relevant new publications in standard journals. Currently, 80% of the references are author's own papers. 2) As the main objective of this paper is 'comparison', a comparison table is necessary to show the key findings of this work. 3) The conclusion part is lengthy and not precise. State your conclusions clearly and concisely. Better to avoid sentences like "Our method used in [6]..." etc. in conclusion.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Needs Revision	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Rohith Krishnan R***
Department, University & Country	***MG University, India***