

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_100780
Title of the Manuscript:	A Novel Alternate Point-taking Strategy for Surrogate-Assisted Evolutionary Algorithm
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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Authors must add Literature review section and highlight key limitations in the work done earlier in the existing domain.</p> <p>Term "The Proposed Method" should have some title and it must be used in the write-up as well and in results rather than using term proposed methodology.</p> <p>Author should use figure number with all sub figures under the figure where it is appeared in the draft.</p> <p>Quality of produced graph needed to be improved for better visibility.</p> <p>Each figure presented in the graphs form in the paper must be discussed in text to elaborate results.</p> <p>Author must cite some latest paper from year 2023 and 2022 as only 1 reference is cited from year 2022.</p> <p>Algorithm needed to be discussed in detail along with pseudo code, flow chart etc.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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:	<b>Ahthasham Sajid</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Baluchistan University of Information Technology Engineering and Management Sciences, Pakistan</b>