

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_124090
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FUZZY LOGICAL OPERATORS.
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

#### **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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Needs to define the importance of the study. Need more explanation about the methodology in a precise manner. The background information is not clearly defined in the introduction section; including problems, objectives, and motivations for the studies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes no need any addition points.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Need to add some recent literature reviews	
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.	Need to find Conceptual Accuracy: Fuzzy logic extends classical Boolean logic. The paper must include correct mathematical formulations for different fuzzy logical operators. A proper comparative study requires a well-defined methodology for comparing the operators. The manuscript should cite relevant foundational works in fuzzy logic.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Some the references are not cited in the article	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to check the grammatical corrections	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

#### 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:	B S Panda
Department, University & Country	Raghu Engineering College, India