



SDI Review Form 1.6

W

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_38568
Title of the Manuscript:	Root Systems, Cartan Matrix and Dynkin Diagrams in Classification of Lie Algebras
Type of the Article	Review 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>)



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 under review deals with some preliminary properties on the theory of representation and classification of Lie algebras. Even if it is considered by the authors to be a review paper, they only expose some basic definitions and results on the topic. Moreover, even if any review paper should summarize the existing literature on the subject, the authors only include seven references in the paper, all of them referred to handbooks for which the exposed concepts and results are considered as introductory. In this regard, the paper could only be considered at most as the introductory part of a review paper devoted to the subject. A lot of development should be included to be considered as a full review paper. Further, the English language should be highly improved in order to speak properly, even from the beginning in the abstract, where the authors indicate that they introduce Lie algebras and some related concepts. The correct sentence would be that the paper deals with the corresponding concepts. The authors do not introduce any new concept. The same happens in the introduction, where the authors indicate, for instance, that they define the concept of toral subalgebra. Furthermore, some of the basic concepts are not right. Thus, for instance: - The bracket product in a Lie algebra is not called commutator. The commutator is a specific example for which a given associative algebra can be endowed with the structure of Lie algebra. - Lie algebras satisfy the so-called Jacobi identity, not the Bianchi identity. At this point I have realized that different parts of the paper have directly been copied from already published papers which are not referenced by the authors (see the plagiarism note below). Plagiarism issue: The authors have included the following paper of Patricia Brent (2008), which deals with root systems of Lie algebras in their paper: http://www.math.uchicago.edu/~may/VIGRE/VIGRE2009/REUPapers/Brent.pdf More specifically, the following sections have been directly copied from the previous paper: 3.4, 4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5, 5.2, 6, 6.2, 6.3 Furthermore, Section 6.1 coincides exactly with the Definition of Dinkin diagram in page 19 of the following paper of Vasja Susic (2011): http://www-f1.ijs.si/~ziherl/Susic11.pdf Section 2.7 is copied from: http://studyres.com/doc/3787265/chapter-4--lie-algebras None reference of any of these papers are included by the authors.	Thank you for your comments 1) As for improvement of the Paper to be a full review paper , we have added some improvements., but for the references we think Helgason's book which we have added already as a reference is an international reference in this field and most reliable, nevertheless we now added more additional references as you can see. 2) The English language was improved and the corrections were made specially in the abstract. 3) The bracket product in Lie algebra sometimes called bracket operation , commutator ..., according to some mathematicians , and this due to the feature of the concept $[X,Y] = XY-YX$. 4) Jacobi identity was modified to Bianchi identity. 5) As for plagiarism: The references you have mentioned are not known for us in order to copy some parts of our paper from them , but since some notions are introductory they me be shared by many other references that is why as we see seemed to you as copied parts from the references you have mentioned. We tried to see these references in the web , but they are inaccessible.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	- Revise the punctuation marks throughout the paper. - Unify the tense in which is written the abstract of the paper. It is preferable to be written in present form. At this point I have realized that different parts of the paper have directly been copied from already published papers which are not referenced by the authors (see the plagiarism note below).	
Optional/General comments		