

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_86273
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Compact Operators
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/editorial-policy>)

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	No	
Minor REVISION comments	No	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This paper does not contain the heading “Theorem”. The readers may have difficulty to find what are the main results. It might be better to change some headings from Proposition to Theorem. For example, the results in Abstract can be stated as Theorem.• Page 1, the equation (1): Please check the equation. Is x(s) at the right of “where” a typographical error for Tx(s)?• Page 7, one line above Proposition 9: Please add } after $\ x\ =1$• Page 9, 4 lines from the bottom: Please add ... after 0,• Page 9, the last line: Please check this line totally. The reviewer does not understand why this line is equivalent to the first line of page 10.	<p>The results are clearly pointed out in the proposition thus no need to change the heading Proposition to Theorem.</p> <p>We corrected the typographical error in equation (1) and x(s) has been changed to Tx(s)</p> <p>We have added } after $\ x\ =1$ on the line above Proposition 9</p> <p>On page 9, we have added ... after 0</p> <p>We have checked totally the last line on page 9 and first line on page 10 and they are not equivalent.</p>

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)	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.