

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_89359
Title of the Manuscript:	On The Fast Evaluation Of Polynomials
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Abstract is the summary of the research work. The main parameters of the abstract are: what, how, and why. What: It includes definition of the research work means what is going on in research work. How: It covers methodology part means define a technique/ methodology that help to execute your research work. Why: It focus application of the research work means where it can use. Abstract should not be more than 250 to 450 word. Overall, your abstract may be more meaningful if you write your abstract as per the above parameters. Overall, your abstract should be more meaningful.	We have rewritten the abstract along these lines as advised by the reviewer.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The paper seems to be very short. It should be better if it includes some more results related to the Concept.	We have added a section that we had not included in the previous version, which deals with the error analysis of our proposal and its comparison with the classical Horner method. Professor Fernando Fueyo Tirado had actively participated in this section and we would like to include him as co-author. Thank you in advance.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Introduction is adequate and sufficient. 2. Without any reference, research work cannot start. References are cited properly. 3. The paper is technically correct. 4. Title is appropriate.	Thanks.

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)	