

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_96637
Title of the Manuscript:	Approximation Algorithms for α -bisubmodular Function Maximization subject to matroid constraint
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.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Dear Researcher 1- The search needs to adjust the mathematical symbols and signs. 2- Add illustrations. 3- Research must be supported by scientific evidence and logical steps. 4- Add recent references. 5- The paper needs to add examples of the basic definitions mentioned in the paper. 6- The introduction needs to mention the chronology of the work. 7- Adjust mathematics symbols. 8- The paper contains a very high percentage of similarity. (Reduce the similarity). 9- Add old sources to the introduction and references. Thank you very much for listening.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No	
Optional/General comments	Thank you very much for your great trust.	

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:	Mustafa Hasan Hadi
Department, University & Country	University of Babylon, Iraq