

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_81472
Title of the Manuscript:	Design standardized program to calculate the related data from single load on single feeder
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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Major corrections.</p> <p>-The English form should be improved, typos are present, and the syntax needs revise to improve legibility.</p> <p>-Then we can re-evaluate it for the potential of the next process.</p> <p>-Check the paper language and make sure all language errors have been fixed. This will help the reader in the future to be more interested in getting the details and knowledge from this paper and resulting in more citations and reputation.</p> <p>-The abstract section needs significant improvement to be clearer and more attractive for future readers. (rewrite the abstract to reflect the main idea and it's results, without any not suitable details) in the ABSTRACT alongside with the obtained results (the results you got it and what is the situation of your results in comparison with other published methods). - Mentioned to the benchmarks which have been used in this paper.</p> <p>-The introduction, e.g., should lead the way throughout the paper. In addition, the benefits coming from this research should be made clearer in the introduction and throughout the paper. I believe, this section needs significant efforts to make things and contributions clearer and flow of the contents.</p> <p>-The research findings and contribution need to be stated clearly. As well as, the obtained results in this paper. So, the authors are requested to connect the main idea and contribution with the obtained results to prove that the proposed method accomplished its main aims and better results.</p> <p>-When referring to related work in the bibliography, adding citations to well-known worldwide journals (especially publications in recent years) would inspire people in its research community to take an interest in this presentation. For example, the following papers might be cited in your work.</p> <p>https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0045782520307945 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360835221001546 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417421014810 https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/978-3-030-10674-4.pdf</p> <p>-An overview of the related works is needed, which can show future readers more details about the problems and the standard methods that have been used to solve similar problems. This can support your work and show the reader how you decided to give the new idea based on some available information.</p> <p>-The authors need to summarize all their findings at the end of the experiment and should also indicate how their findings can help to carry out the surgical case scheduling.</p> <p>The discussion was too shallow and did not explain why the proposed method was superior. The authors are also requested to focus on the obtained results and reflect the proposed method's effect on them. The robustness about the method have not been discussed.</p> <p>-Check the mathematical notation, especially for the proposed method. This will facilitate the new readers' tracking and applying of the proposed method and get the same results.</p> <p>-In the conclusion section, it will include research contributions, research limitations, and future works. This part should summarize the whole paper and give the readers full screen to understand the idea, work, contribution, problem, results, new potential work, and others. What are the pros and cons of the proposed method ? Please respond to this question in the</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>article text.</p> <p>-The discussion of the results needs to include the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed algorithm.</p> <p>-Furthermore, where are the limitations of your study? Clarifying the limitations of a study allows the readers to understand better under which conditions the results should be interpreted. A clear description of limitations of a study also shows that the researcher has a holistic understanding of his/her study. However, the authors fail to demonstrate this in their paper.</p> <p>-Various figures are not explained well. I suggest adding a brief description of each figure in their captions.</p> <p>References have not been written in a same format according to the journal reference writing style. They have been listed untidily.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Laith Abualigah
Department, University & Country	Amman Arab University, Jordan