



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_63937
Title of the Manuscript:	Implementation of a computerized system based on the Recursive Core Heuristic (RCH) algorithm for optimal filling of tankers
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the texts of sections 2.3, 2.3.1, and 2.3.2, the rules of copying are not observed. Please rewrite these sections, and add the references of the reference papers. 2. The paper has many grammatical errors including punctuation, spacing, and spelling errors that should be addressed. 3. The sections of the paper are not numbered correctly and need to be corrected. 4. In the "Literature Review" section, the preliminaries of the work are presented. Therefore, it is better to change the "Literature Review" to "Preliminaries." 5. It is highly recommended to mentioned several related studies and discuss their methodologies, strengths, and weaknesses in the paper. 6. Please state your contributions in the Introduction section. 7. All formulas, equations, and pseudo-codes should be typed in the paper. Please type them instead of using them as pictures. 8. The quality of the figures should be increased; their text is not clear enough to be read. 9. How did you evaluate the proposed system in terms of optimality? Are there any other applications for the system? Please discuss these in the paper. 10. The Conclusion should be rewritten. 11. The number of references is inadequate. Kindly increase the quantity of the references list, including the following papers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMPA: an innovative hybrid multi-population algorithm based on artificial ecosystem-based and Harris Hawks optimization algorithms for engineering problems. • A new hybrid chaotic atom search optimization based on tree-seed algorithm and Levy flight for solving optimization problems. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is better to make the table style more attractive. • The headings can be written in more informative forms. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	Saeid Barshandeh
Department, University & Country	Afagh Higher Education Institute, Iran