

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_94246
Title of the Manuscript:	Alternative Method (Penalty method) for Solving Assignment and Comparative Study with Existing Methods.
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.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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper would be interested if the corrections highlighted in the manuscript are corrected. The work developed a new algorithm, but one numerical example is not enough to justify it. I suggest two more numerical examples to be incorporated in the paper. Again, you should not boarder displaying the solution of the examples for the Hungarian method; rather concentrate in the solution of your proposed technique. In the table for your numerical example, 14 was written at cost (2, 5), but 4 was used to solve the problem. For instance, the penalty at row 2 is supposed to be 41, but you wrote 51; and the penalty for row 5 is supposed to be 4, but you wrote 9. Kindly address these issues.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It should be noted that the computation of an assignment problem via an existing Hungarian technique is easier than your developed technique. However, it would be better you write a programming language code for the developed algorithm using python, RStudio, mathematica, maple or anyone you are familiar with, or perhaps you suggest/recommend it for further studies. Check your manuscript and effect all the corrections pointed out there.	

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:	Jude Opara
Department, University & Country	Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Nigeria