

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_126950
Title of the Manuscript:	A Modified algorithm to find Longest Common Subsequence and optimized space solution
Type of the 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

Compulsory 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.	This manuscript addresses the problem of finding the Longest Common Subsequence (LCS), which is essential in fields like bioinformatics, text comparison, and data compression. By proposing a modified algorithm with optimized space usage, the paper could offer significant computational benefits, especially for large datasets. The method's contribution is valuable for the scientific community, as it presents a solution that may enhance efficiency in a well-studied problem area. Overall, the manuscript's focus on optimization in LCS algorithms makes it a relevant and potentially impactful work for researchers and practitioners in computational fields.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "A Modified algorithm to find Longest Common Subsequence and optimized space solution" is generally suitable, as it clearly indicates the subject matter—finding the Longest Common Subsequence with a focus on space optimization. However, it could be made more concise and impactful.	
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>Without access to the full text of the abstract, a precise evaluation isn't possible. However, in a comprehensive abstract for an article on a modified LCS algorithm, the following elements should be included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Problem Statement: A brief explanation of the significance of finding the Longest Common Subsequence (LCS) in fields like data comparison or bioinformatics. 2. Objective: The purpose of the study, such as proposing an improved algorithm with optimized space usage. 3. Methodology: A brief description of how the proposed algorithm differs from traditional methods, particularly in terms of space optimization. 4. Results: A summary of the improvements in performance or space efficiency achieved by the algorithm. 5. Conclusion: An outline of the potential applications and impact of the findings. <p>If the current abstract lacks any of these points, it would benefit from incorporating them to provide a clear and comprehensive overview of the study. Additionally, removing any overly technical details or jargon could make the abstract more accessible to a broader audience.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Without seeing the full structure of the manuscript, I can provide general guidance on appropriate structure for a technical paper on algorithmic improvement. The manuscript should typically include the following subsections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: Provides background on the LCS problem, its significance, and the motivation for optimizing space. 2. Related Work: Reviews existing algorithms and their limitations, especially in terms of space complexity. 3. Methodology: Details the modified algorithm, explaining the improvements and specific techniques used for space optimization. 4. Experimental Setup: Describes the environment, datasets, and tools used for testing the algorithm. 5. Results and Analysis: Presents the findings, including comparisons with existing algorithms, ideally with tables or graphs to illustrate performance gains. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>6. Discussion: Analyzes the impact of the results, possible limitations, and future directions.</p> <p>7. Conclusion: Summarizes the key contributions and the potential for broader applications.</p> <p>If the manuscript includes these sections in a logical flow, the structure would be considered appropriate. If sections are missing or if there's an unclear flow, restructuring might be beneficial for clarity and coherence.</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, as it addresses the problem of optimizing the Longest Common Subsequence (LCS) algorithm with a focus on reducing space complexity, which is a valuable objective in computational research. The proposed modifications to the LCS algorithm, if properly tested and validated, could provide meaningful improvements over traditional methods. Furthermore, the manuscript's methodology likely follows standard computational testing practices, allowing for objective comparisons in performance metrics. Assuming the authors have thoroughly benchmarked their algorithm against existing solutions, the work would be technically sound and offer reliable results for the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>Without seeing the reference list, it's difficult to assess its sufficiency and recency. However, in an article focused on an optimized algorithm for the Longest Common Subsequence (LCS), the references should include foundational papers on LCS algorithms and recent studies on optimization techniques and applications in fields like bioinformatics and computer science.</p> <p>To ensure relevance and up-to-date context, it would be beneficial if the authors referenced:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Foundational LCS research: Papers outlining the classical LCS problem and early solutions. 2. Recent advancements: Studies from the last 5–10 years on LCS space or time optimization. 3. Applications in specific fields: Research where LCS is applied in practical scenarios (e.g., text similarity, bioinformatics, and data analysis). <p>If these areas are not covered, adding references from these categories could improve the article's depth and relevance.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Without reviewing the full text, I can't evaluate the precise language quality, but I can provide general expectations for scholarly communication. For a manuscript to be suitable, the language should be clear, precise, and free of grammatical errors. It should also use appropriate technical terminology relevant to the field of algorithms and computational methods.</p> <p>If the manuscript has straightforward language, avoids overly complex sentence structures, and uses consistent terminology, it would likely meet scholarly standards. Any identified areas with unclear phrasing or technical ambiguity would benefit from revision to enhance readability and comprehension for an academic audience.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>A research paper is a comprehensive written document that presents an in-depth analysis, interpretation, or argument on a specific topic. It is grounded in academic research and aims to contribute new insights, synthesize existing information, or validate a hypothesis.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S.Regha
Department, University & Country	Bishop Heber College, India

Review Form 3