SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMCS_37931**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Novel Multiplier using Vedic Mathematics and Booth Encoding**
Type of the Article	**Short 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)

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 introduction is very clear and it puts the work in the good frame. Authors investigate and interpret experimental results determined from standard materials, and, follow a clear methodology. Results are presented with a good clarity and acceptable accuracy. As such, I would recommend that the paper can be published subject to some very minor changes.**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. The paper needs proper formatting right from the beginning in introduction. 2. The table 3 last row, column first need to be corrected "level of". 3. The Vedic sutra and Booth is well known so a brief related work is must in introduction which states the current state of art in the field and motivation of current work. 4. The novel word in the title must be justified by the result or by some architecture difference from the conventional. 5. Synthesis Report shows that proposed architecture consumes more LUT and slices than conventional and only logic levels are reduced, might be increase in speed increase the Power but not taken in consideration please justify. 6. Model SIM is a single word please correct. 7. There is strong need to write the USP of the paper in abstract to make it more convenient to publish.	
Optional/General comments	The paper will be in good position if take the consideration as mentioned in revision	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Gaurav Purohit***
Department, University & Country	***CSIR CEERI, India***