

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_83743
Title of the Manuscript:	Catalyst Optimization Design based on Artificial Neural Network
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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The idea of this study is interesting and worthy. However, considering the many articles in this field, it seems that this article does not have a good innovation and also some results do not seem to be correct (database too lean). The following modification should be made: - Abstract: some of the resulted should be mentioned in this section. - As you know, many papers have been done on Catalyst Optimization Design based on Artificial Neural Network. What is the novelty of your paper? Please note exactly and add in the paper, - Most of the results are just reported in the paper and there is no strong analysis. Further analysis should be performed for each result.	In the revised manuscript some of the resulted have been mentioned in abstract section. Some analysis of the research results has been added in the revised manuscript
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)	