

Review Form2

Book Name:	Mathematics and Computer Science: Contemporary Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2500
Title of the Manuscript:	Python Based Modelling of Logic Gates
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :		

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The authors provides a good overview of the Python module's purpose, Python Based Modelling of Logic Gates. However, it would benefit from more detail regarding the specific logic gates implemented and the types of numerical problems used for validation. The manuscript presents valuable findings, there are areas where additional information and clarification would enhance its quality: 1. Please provide more detail on the methodology employed to verify the code's accuracy. A brief description of the testing process and any benchmarks would strengthen the abstract. 2. Including quantitative performance metrics, such as execution time or memory usage, would offer a clearer understanding of the module's efficiency. 3. While the alignment with existing outcomes is acknowledged, a comparison with other tools or modules in the literature would highlight the significance of your findings. 4. The statement about "minimal effort and errors" needs clarification. Does this pertain to user errors, coding errors, or both? Providing examples of how errors were minimized would improve the manuscript. 5. It would be helpful to discuss the potential applications of the Python module in educational or practical contexts, as this would help readers appreciate its relevance and utility.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maryam Shaveisi
Department, University & Country	Kermanshah University of Technology, Iran