

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_97654
Title of the Manuscript:	A HYBRID METHOD OF BACKPROPAGATION AND PARTICLE SWARM OPTIMIZATION FOR ENHANCING ACCURATION PERFORMANCE
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.journalcjust.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)
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)	1.Yes. 2.Yes. 3.Yes. 4.Yes. 5.Yes. 6.Yes. This topic looks interesting. I have some other comments as follows: (1) In References, the format is inconsistent. Sometimes with volumes and numbers, and sometimes without them. (2) For some figures, the numbers/texts are covered. For example, in Figure 5, the numbers are covered by curves. (3) What do the numbers mean on the horizontal line in Figure 5? Decimal? If so, please use dots instead of commas.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is basically good. However, there still are a few English grammar errors. For example, "ACCURATION" in the title, "These set..."(Section 2.1, Line 2) . Hope the author(s) can check and correct them.	
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:	Xinxing Wu
Department, University & Country	Midway University, United States