

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_113741
Title of the Manuscript:	Hungarian Technique and Selection of Optimized Plan of Insurance
Type of the Article	

### 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</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, but it needs to be explained in detail about the benefits and contributions of research. Especially in the abstract and introduction sections. In this research it is also necessary to add an explanation of the trial results of applying the Hungarian technique, and the percentage of success of the Hungarian technique in providing optimal solutions.</p> <p>Yes, it's appropriate</p> <p>The abstract should present the benefits research results described in detail. Apart from that, it is also necessary to present an accuracy test of the application of the Hungarian technique for insurance selection and optimization.</p> <p>Yes, it's appropriate</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references used are the latest, but there are still minimal references. The author can add several more references so that the information presented will be more valuable.</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, it is suitable</p>	
<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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Heni Sulistiani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia, Indonesia</b>