

**Review Form 1.7**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science</b>          |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JAMCS_113741</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Hungarian Technique and Selection of Optimized Plan of Insurance</b> |
| Type of the Article      |   |

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>Yes, the manuscript is suitable for the consumption of scientific community.</p> <p>Yes, the title is correct and suitable for this journal.</p> <p>The abstract is short and straightforward. However, the author could have been very specific about his/her data source and its quantum/quantity as well – the number of data used is too small.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections are appropriate and well arranged. However, the author was too silence on the main concept 'Life Insurance Plan'. This could have been detailed on at the INTRODUCTION section. Also, as regards the methodology, the author could have make a comparative analysis of the methodology adopted and other existing ones and then justify the position of his/her adopted methodology.</p> <p>The references/literature did not cover research works on insurance/insurance plan. Author(s) should access, read and cite works on this. This is the centrality and not the methodology. The author was discussing modelling approach under the related works – no, the related works should be works done on insurance/insurance plan using different evaluation/assessment approaches.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>Yes</p>   |  |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  |  |  |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Ajayi Olusola Olajide</b>               |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Adekunle Ajasin University, Nigeria</b> |