

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_130101
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing Traversal Strategies: Depth-First Search vs. Breadth-First Search in Complex Networks
Type of the Article	Review 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.	This article compares two fundamental graph traversal algorithms, Breadth-First Search (BFS) and Depth-First Search (DFS), highlighting their applications in pathfinding, network optimization, and classification tasks. Through systematic analysis using performance indicators like execution time, memory usage, and path length, the study found DFS to be better for deep searches in memory-constrained environments, while BFS excelled in finding shortest paths and providing comprehensive coverage. Additionally, the paper underscores the potential of hybrid techniques that combine the strengths of both algorithms for improved results in specific scenarios.	Thank you for your insightful comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	suitable	Thank you.
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.	No modifications needed	Noted.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	yes	Okay.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference 1 – not related to the article	Noted.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	good	Okay.
Optional/General comments	Alignment, font formatting and minor spelling mistakes must be checked.	Noted.

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>	