Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_130580**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Adaptive Search Algorithms: A Comprehensive Overview and Emerging Optimization Trends**
Type of the Article	**Article**

<mark>**PART 1:**</mark> **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.	I think this topic is very interesting and the algorithm seems applicable to solve the famous optimization problems. There are some minor issues that should be corrected and to be taken account to improve the quality of the paper. But in general the manuscript highlight an interesting part of the optimization	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**The title is suitable**	
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.	**I suggest to review the abstract , they should highlight the main achievement of the study**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes is sufficient , specially the have a recent references (2019 , 2020)	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	They should review the quality oh the writing in English , they are some spilling mistakes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	**In general I think it's Ok** 1- The quality of writing should be review, there are even spelling mistake like optimization with S instead of Z . 2- We should highlight in the Abstract the main achievement of your study 3- I think the distribution of sections is not good because I got confused the first time I started reading. 4- Renumber the Background theory section and literature review and try to put the other subtitles for the other paragraphs 5- Conclusion is too limited , Please explain the main achievement of the study	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Cherrat Khaoula**
Department, University & Country	**Chouaïb Doukkali University, Morocco**