

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_127078
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimal Project Allocation
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic is valuable as it addresses a fundamental issue in academic and organizational settings, where efficient project allocation can enhance both participant satisfaction and productivity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Complexity Analysis of Algorithmic Approaches for Optimal Student-Project Allocation	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a solid overview of the manuscript's objectives and key findings. However, I suggest emphasizing that the algorithms were compared in a controlled setting and noting which algorithms performed best for specific criteria to improve the abstract's clarity and comprehensiveness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, with clear sections for each algorithm and comprehensive subsections detailing methodology, constraints, and analysis.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are appropriate and cover foundational works which is essential for understanding the study's methodology. However, adding recent studies on project allocation or heuristic-based algorithms in educational contexts could enhance the manuscript's depth. For instance, more recent work on hybrid methods for allocation problems could provide a broader perspective on alternative approaches.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript could benefit from a brief discussion on the potential impact of computational limitations for large datasets, as the Score-Based Allocation is computationally intensive. Additionally, adding limitations and future research directions in the conclusion would enhance the manuscript's value for readers interested in further developing these algorithms.	

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>	

[Review Form 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Basha Bin Usman
Department, University & Country	Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Nigeria