

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_102486
Title of the Manuscript:	An Enhanced Dung Beetle Optimization Algorithm for Global Optimization
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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The paper proposes an enhanced Deng beetle optimization algorithm. The authors claim that this variety outperforms the classical EDBO.</p> <p>The paper is well structured, and the subjects fall within the topic of the journal. In general, the written English is good.</p> <p>Please add the functions name to tables 1 and 2.</p> <p>In order to improve the paper, other algorithms like PSO and GA should be compared.</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	E. J. Solteiro Pires
Department, University & Country	UTAD University, Portugal