

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The proposed idea is appreciated. Good Trial. The paper explains about the existing and proposed idea of the research.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract is clear.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is framed with proper scientific references.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically compared and proved.</p> <p>6. Only 10 papers are referred. May be more papers are referred.</p> <p>Additional comments: The word "We" may be avoided.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>More number of papers may be taken as references. The quality of the paper is Good</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Literature review may separately given with title.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	L. Sankari
Department, University & Country	Sri Ramakrishna College of Arts & Science for Women, Bharathiar University, India