



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_38517
Title of the Manuscript:	An efficient CRT Based Reverse Converter for $\{2^{2n+1}-1, 2^n-1, 2^{2n}-1\}$ Moduli Set
Type of the Article	Method 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	This paper generally presents a research work in which the author(s) provide a reverse converter for the moduli set $\{2^{2n+1}-1, 2^n-1, 2^{2n}-1\}$ using a Chinese Remainder Theorem (CRT) algorithm and reverse method of data conversion. In detail, the paper is a brief report regarding the performed work. From a general perspective, the paper seems having a value with a technical subject followed. But before it can be published in the JAMS, the following major revisions should also be done: 1- The Introduction section should be improved by providing more explanations regarding background and objectives of the study. 2- Some equations seem in pixel formats, which make it difficult to read. That should be fixed. 3- The figure should have a caption. 4- There should be some more discussion regarding the performed application. Currently, the papers seem like a conference paper because of its limited discussion side. 5- Conclusions section should be improved by providing more explanations regarding the performed work, future works...etc. Thanks the author(s) for their valuable efforts to form this paper.	I thank the Reviewer for sparing time out of his valuable time to go through my manuscript and raising some observations. . 1. Observation is now corrected in the manuscript. 2. Observation is now corrected in the manuscript. 3. Observation is now corrected in the manuscript. 4. Observation is now corrected in the manuscript. 5. Direction for future research is now pointed out in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	-	