

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_130522
Title of the Manuscript:	Real-World Implementations of Network Centrality Algorithms across Various Fields
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 paper is important for scientists because it looks at how network centrality methods can be used in real life in many areas, including healthcare, transportation, social networks, and hacking. It shows how measures of centrality can be used to find important nodes, make better decisions, and boost network performance. The paper also talks about problems with scale and suggests areas for future study. It is an important addition to the field of network science.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Real-World Implementations of Network Centrality Algorithms across Various Fields" is a good topic, but it could be shorter and more interesting. "Practical Applications of Network Centrality Algorithms Across Domains" is a better title.	Title revised
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 outline is complete, but it could use more emphasis on how new the study is and what it means for other areas of life. Also, it should be short and organized so that it's easy to understand. You might want to change the way you say it to draw attention to certain efforts, like case studies or suggested answers to problems with growth.	ok
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Based on the information given, the text seems to be scientifically correct. But certain algorithms or methods should be put in a better context by mentioning their assumptions or limits so that everyone can understand them fully.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are a lot of recent and detailed references that cover a wide range of topics that are important to the text. If more sources are needed, they could make the talk stronger. For example, works on mixed centrality measures or new machine learning uses in network analysis.	Revised
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is mostly good enough for academic writing, but there are a few small spelling and grammar mistakes. Revising these problems will make them easier to read and more professional.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper shows that it is useful and relevant to science for researchers, and network centrality methods can be used in many different ways.</p> <p>But the general needs to be clearer, ethical issues need to be talked about more in depth, and the novelty of the work needs to be explained better.</p> <p>Some spelling and grammar mistakes need to be fixed.</p> <p>The standard of the text would be better if there was a statement of opposing interests and all the sources were properly mentioned.</p>	<p>Effectuated</p> <p>Corrected as suggested</p>

Review Form 3

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>	