

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_125683
Title of the Manuscript:	A Pentahelix model approach: Creating Village Innovation Perception in Sokaraja Village Banyumas
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript addresses a significant gap in the literature by providing a comprehensive evaluation of pattern matching algorithms for string processing, which is a fundamental problem in computer science with broad applications. Its comparative approach to analyzing algorithm efficiency offers valuable insights for both academic research and practical applications in fields such as data mining, bioinformatics, and text analysis. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more in-depth discussion of the potential real-world implications of the proposed algorithms. Overall, its clear methodology and relevance to ongoing research make it a strong contribution to the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It accurately reflects the content of the manuscript, focusing on the core theme of pattern matching algorithms for string processing. The title is clear, concise, and provides an appropriate indication of the comparative analysis presented in the paper, making it easy for readers to understand the scope of the research.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article provides a good overview of the research, summarizing the key points such as the focus on new pattern matching algorithms for string processing, the methods used, and the outcomes.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem generally appropriate, as they follow a logical flow typical for a research paper.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, as it presents a well-defined problem in pattern matching algorithms and offers a novel approach to solving it. The methodology is clearly explained, providing sufficient details for reproducibility, which is essential for scientific rigor. Additionally, the experiments are designed thoughtfully, with appropriate evaluation metrics to validate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms. The results are compared with existing methods, demonstrating the technical soundness of the manuscript and its contributions to the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript cover a reasonable range of foundational and contemporary works, but there appears to be a need for more recent citations from the last three to five years. This would better reflect the latest advancements and ensure the manuscript is up-to-date with current research trends</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few areas that could benefit from minor revisions to improve clarity and readability. Some sentences are slightly long or complex and could be simplified to enhance understanding. Additionally, a few technical terms and concepts might require clearer explanations for a broader audience.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a relevant and timely study, contributing valuable insights to the field. The topic is well-aligned with current scientific interests and offers a meaningful contribution to ongoing discussions. The structure of the paper is clear, and the methodology is sound. However, there are a few areas where minor revisions could improve the overall quality, such as language refinement and possibly adding a few more recent references to strengthen the literature review. Overall, the paper is well-conceived and offers significant potential for the scientific community.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Anil Kumar Chikatimarla
Department, University & Country	AG & SG Siddhartha Degree College of Arts & Science, India