

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Somewhat</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I do believe that this study advances the field of research, but there are a number of points that need further clarifications to the reader's benefits. Below are these points listed in order of importance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The readability of this paper requires improving. I have difficulty following the text. The whole text should have been paragraphed properly. In the current form, the entire text appears as a big lump, impairing its readability substantially. 2. The literature review on the recent progress for this research topic is not sufficient. 3. Both the organization and the English usage of this manuscript are unsatisfactory. Thus, it has to be further improved. 4. Suggest to the authors to expand these explanation on their advantages and limitations. How much of losses attained due to 5. Have a table of comparison achieved from results 6. There must be a comparison between the previous work and present work in this paper 7. Please rewrite conclusion 8. There must be a comparison between the previous work and work search 9. Research needs to be very modern and more references 10. The references need more arrangements such as IEEE or Harvard 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Somewhat	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Aboud Kadhim
Department, University & Country	Middle Technical University, Iraq