

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>

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>1. Strengths of the Paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction clearly defines the goals of employing BFS and DFS, including optimizing tourist routes, improving travel efficiency, and enhancing historical knowledge acquisition. By citing real-world studies (e.g., Yosdarso Afero, Julian Sahertian, and Yuliana et al.), the introduction provides a strong foundation and demonstrates practical applications of these algorithms in tourism and other domains. The integration of computer science with tourism is a significant strength, showcasing how technology can effectively address challenges in cultural and historical tourism. 	Thank you for your detailed review of the revised paper.

Review Form 3

	<p>2. Potential Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract provides general findings but does not explicitly state which algorithm performs better under specific conditions. While execution time, memory usage, and path length are essential, other metrics like scalability, robustness to graph size, and adaptability to dynamic graphs could be included. Graphs, tables, or comparative charts summarizing performance metrics would enhance the understanding of results. The abstract mentions hybrid techniques but does not elaborate on specific examples, methodologies, or their comparative performance. <p>3. Suggestions for Improvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Limit the examples to tourism-related applications to maintain relevance and focus. Non-tourism examples (e.g., Neo4j queries or web crawling) can be shifted to later sections or appendices. Include numerical results or measurable impacts from the referenced studies to strengthen claims about the effectiveness of these algorithms. Summarize referenced studies more concisely, emphasizing their key contributions rather than delving into excessive detail. Divide the introduction into clear sections, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background on Tourism and Technology. Role of Graph Traversal Algorithms. Real-World Applications and Supporting Studies. <p>4. Areas of Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction is dense with information, referencing numerous studies and diverse contexts. This might overwhelm readers, particularly those unfamiliar with graph traversal algorithms. There is a noticeable jump between tourism applications, algorithmic details, and unrelated use cases (e.g., Neo4j and web crawling). Smoother transitions are needed to maintain coherence. The advantages of BFS and DFS are discussed broadly. Including more specific metrics or examples (e.g., quantifiable improvements in travel time or the number of sites covered) would strengthen the arguments. <p>5. Future Scope and Research Directions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore how hybrid approaches combining BFS and DFS can address limitations in tourism route optimization. Investigate the scalability of these algorithms in handling larger and more complex tourist networks. Examine the integration of graph traversal algorithms with AI and machine learning for predictive analytics in tourism. 	
--	---	--

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	