

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_128026
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving Canopy Clustering with Intelligent Optimization Algorithms
Type of the Article	Original 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is concise but lacks sufficient detail. It should provide a comprehensive summary of the study, including key objectives, methodology, and results. 2. The citations are not formatted correctly or consistently. The author should adhere to the prescribed citation style and verify the accuracy of references. 3. The manuscript lacks adequate referencing to support its claims. The author is advised to include more relevant and recent references to enhance the credibility and context of the study. 4. There is a noticeable misalignment between the stated objectives and the reported achievements. The author should either revise the objectives to reflect the scope of the results or provide additional data and discussion to justify the claimed achievements. 	
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.	The abstract is concise but lacks sufficient detail. It should provide a comprehensive summary of the study, including key objectives, methodology, and results.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript lacks adequate referencing to support its claims. The author is advised to include more relevant and recent references to enhance the credibility and context of the study.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Author needs to improve quality	
Optional/General 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>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Teena Vats
Department, University & Country	Maharishi University, India