

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_97011
Title of the Manuscript:	Future trails for integer programming and relations to artificial intelligence
Type of the Article	Review 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The paper provides an overview of approaches to solving the problem of integer programming of a large dimension, including their use as part of artificial intelligence algorithms. However, the given description is superficial and presents the corresponding algorithms at the level of a general idea. From this point of view, the paper may be interesting for scientists who first time study these issues. For specialists who wish to learn more about the above algorithms, or to apply them in practice, it is worth studying other sources, perhaps those used in the article for citation.</p> <p>2. The title of the paper is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the paper requires revision (see notes below).</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the paper require revision (see notes below).</p> <p>5. The paper is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>Some remarks.</p> <p>1. The "Conclusion" block of the "ABSTRACT" section contains the statement "Some initial computational findings are also shown ...". But the paper does not contain any calculations. The author(s) should clarify the meaning of this statement.</p> <p>2. Section "4. Conclusion" doesn't correspond to conducted investigations, presented in the paper's text. In particular, it mentions "problems with 0-1 variables...", but this problem doesn't consider in the paper. It is recommended to clearly formulate research objectives and form conclusions in accordance with the consideration of ones. Subscripts for variable x in section "1. Introduction" and in formula (D) , section 3.2.1 "Application to Branch and Bound algorithm" must be subscript symbols</p> <p>3. It is necessary to design the text of the article in a uniform formatting style. In particular, Section 3.1 contains only one indexed subsection, although there are actually two of them. Subsection "Outcome of the study" in section 3.3. has no index. The title of section 3.3 has a different format than other sections of this structural level. The block in Figure 1 does not have a pointer to the next block, although there is one in the description of the corresponding algorithm. Subscripts for variable x in section "1. Introduction" and in formula (D), section 3.2.1 "Application to Branch and Bound algorithm" must be subscript symbols. The author (s) should carefully check that the formatting of the text of the article meets the requirements.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language/English quality of the paper is suitable for scholarly communications	
<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:	Pavlo Hryhoruk
Department, University & Country	Khmelnyskyi National University, Ukraine