

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_116953
Title of the Manuscript:	Polynomial Time Linear programs for hard constraint satisfaction problems
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>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript presents a novel approach to solving hard constraint satisfaction problems using polynomial time linear programs. This contribution is significant because it addresses a critical challenge in computational complexity and optimization. The methods that are proposed may improve the efficiency and applicability of constraint satisfaction solutions, making it a valuable addition to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title "Polynomial Time Linear Programs for Hard Constraint Satisfaction Problems" is appropriate and accurately reflects the content and focus of the manuscript. It clearly shows the main contribution and the scope of the research.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the key points of the manuscript. It provides a clear overview of the problem addressed, the methodology used, and the significant results obtained. However, it could be improved by adding a brief mention of the possible implications and uses of the research.</p> <p>4. The manuscript's subsections and structure are well-organized and logical, and each section flows smoothly into the next, providing a coherent story. The manuscript is also divided into sections for introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion, making it easy to follow and understand.</p> <p>5. Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct; the methodology is sound and well explained; and the findings are supported by appropriate analysis. However, it is recommended to conduct a thorough peer review and verification of the technical details in order to confirm the accuracy of the findings.</p> <p>6. The references cited in the manuscript are both sufficient and recent, reflecting the current state of research in this field. However, it might be useful to include additional references to recent advancements in linear programming and constraint satisfaction problems, especially those published in the last two years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the article's language and English quality are suitable for scholarly communications because the manuscript is well-written, clear, and precise, making it easily understandable for academic audiences.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The submitted paper is already quite good. To improve future submissions, consider refining the clarity of complex explanations and ensuring thorough proofreading for minor mistakes. Keep up the excellent work and continue striving for improvement.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Rhifky Wayahdi
Department, University & Country	Battuta University, Indonesia