

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_103090
Title of the Manuscript:	Research Progress of Robot Path Planning Algorithm
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript provides a review of major approaches to path planning in robotics, which is of relevance to anyone working in the field of robotics.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable synthesizing well the article's subject,</p> <p>3. The abstract is clear and comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections are appropriate</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, but it is incomplete, in the section 4, regarding the intelligent algorithms, those based on neural networks, reinforcement learning and also deep reinforcement learning which combines the previous two should also be reviewed, in order for the article to provide for the state-of-the-art in path planning.</p> <p>6. While the references are appropriate to the article's content, a literature review directed at the points referred above in review comment 5 is needed for completion of the work, as it stands the article, while interesting and readable is incomplete.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The article is clear and well-written.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Carlos Pedro Gonçalves
Department, University & Country	School of Economic Sciences and Organizations, Lusophone University, Portugal