

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_123790
Title of the Manuscript:	Intelligent Tuning of Fuzzy- \mathcal{L}_1 Adaptive Controller for Uncertain Nonlinear MIMO Systems Using Multi-Objective Particle Swarm Optimization
Type of the Article	Reserach

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 work looks good for the simple reason of the fact that it proposes an efficient approach for tuning the L_1 feedback filter of adaptive controllers for multi-input multi-output (MIMO) systems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Very adequate	
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.	I did not see where he compared his work to other literature	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes but for this kind of novel work, I expected more flesh to be given to the work	
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.	Yes as I said some results would have been compared to other work. This will make the work more robust.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	The introduction/literature/related work could have looked at some excellent or more recent work in this regard. Possible look at where AI was adopted. Hence, I humbly suggest that the author add these references too. The work is good just add more references. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Optimal Location and Sizing of Photovoltaic-Based Distributed Generations to Improve the Efficiency and Symmetry of a Distribution Network by Handling Random Constraints of Particle Swarm Optimization Algorithm". Symmetry, vol.15, no.9, pp.1752; https://doi.org/10.3390/sym15091752, 2023. 2. Integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI), Internet of Things (IoT) and 5G for Next-Generation Smart grid: A Survey of Trends and Prospect" IEEE Access, Vol 10, pp. 4794-4831, 2022. 3. Performance Analysis of a MIMO Channel Simulator for Smart Grid Communications" IEEE PES/IAS Power Africa Conference, Johannesburg, South Africa, 2024. 4. Development of an Optimum Beamforming Strategy for Outdoor Communication in Millimeter Wave Wireless Sensor Network" Journal of Communications, vol. 18, no. 9, pp. 545-554, doi:10.12720/jcm.18.9.545-554, 2023. 5. Leveraging on the Cognitive Radio Channel Aggregation Strategy for Next Generation Utility Networks Energies, Special Issue on Smart Energy of the Future 2019, Vol. 12, no.14, 2753, doi:10.3390/en12142753. 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes(Minor REVISION)	
Optional/General comments	The author did a good work. Just go through one more time and do the correction advised. Accept after corrections.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ebenezer Esenogho
Department, University & Country	University of Johannesburg, South Africa