

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_102527
Title of the Manuscript:	Packing Problem and Random Coverage in Continuous Domain
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>)

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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Ans: Yes. If Author(s) can add applications, advantages and disadvantages as separate section that would be great.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Ans: Looks good to me.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Ans: Yes.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Ans: Yes.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Ans: Yes.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form Ans: Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>For detail information can Author(s) refer manuscript for the comments?</p> <p>1) Abstract is repeated in Introduction. Can Author(s) remove redundant information?</p> <p>2) Can Author(s) write more detail information in Abstract?</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manu Mitra
Department, University & Country	University of Bridgeport, USA