

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCOS_122713</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Enhancing Compressed Sensing with Graph Structural Constraints: A Novel Approach to Active Learning in Measurement Matrices</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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 importance of this article is it is clear that the recovery of the thin signal from the matrix made by the proposed method and the recovery with the convex optimization algorithm has the highest	
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.	Overall, this is a clear, concise, and well-written manuscript. The introduction is relevant and theory based. Sufficient information about the previous study findings is presented for readers to follow the present study rationale and procedures. The methods are generally appropriate, although clarification of a few details and provision of a rationale for the use of this particular method of measuring eating disorder symptoms should be provided.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Providing an estimate of the test-retest reliability would be helpful in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Considering that limited works have been done in the field of measurement matrix construction in the field of compressed sensing on the graph, in this article, with an idea similar to the idea of active learning, a method to improve the construction of the measurement matrix has been presented, the result of which is a stronger recovery of the thinnest signal that matches the measurement.</li> <li>➤</li> </ul>	
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.	The matrix and the ambiguity criterion after the third step will be as follows, and as can be seen, the ambiguity criterion randomly selects an edge from the set of edges with the lowest number of observations and travels a random path is requiring more comparison.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Enough	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need some improvement	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>P. Senthil Pandian</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Solamalai College of Engineering, India</b>