

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_98707
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Binary Search and Interpolation Search for Searching Identification Numbers on National Identity Cards
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)
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)	Yes, it is. Suggested title: Speed Analysis of Binary Search and Interpolation Search for Searching Identification Numbers on National Identity Cards Yes, it is. Flow charts are not described clearly. Lot of acronyms without abbreviations. Mathematical backgrounds are missing for the algorithm. Need more references on algorithms. And all the references are recent. Paper needs depth in technical and mathematical content. It look like shallow in the content.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Moderate	
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:	S. Anita
Department, University & Country	St. Anne's College of Engineering and Technology, India