ReviewForm3

JournalName:	**Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science**
ManuscriptNumber:	**Ms_JAMCS_130881**
TitleoftheManuscript:	**OptiFlexSort:AnAdvancedHybridSortingAlgorithmforEfficientLarge-ScaleDataProcessing**
TypeoftheArticle	

	Reviewer'scomment	Author'sFeedback *(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpart inthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback 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.	The proposed algorithm is based on an optimized pivot selection strategy combined with adaptive partitioning to improve performance on large datasets. This algorithm is well suited to large data sets, where it offers a good compromise between efficiency and flexibility	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title of the article is appropriate but poorly formulated**	
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.	1-please delete all the we's in your text. they're everywhere, starting with your abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	reasonable	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	the references are not sufficient and most of them are old. there are very recent works like this one for example: https://doi.org/10.4236/jcc.2024.121009	

ReviewForm3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Moyen	
Optional/General comments	1- Can the systematic choice of the last element as a pivot be effective for data sets that are already sorted or quasi-sorted? If not, how do you intend to remedy the situation? 2- The first 129 words of your introduction peremptorily assert the limits of Quicksort algorithms and pose a problem with no foundation or scientific basis. a problem is identified after a situational analysis referenced by published scientific works in the field, in other words, a problem is posed after a good little review of the literature. 3- From the moment you say: "this research proposes", you must say what you do and not quote works. 4- The end of the last paragraph of your paper doesn't present the rest of the work. 5- In general, your introduction needs to be completely redone. 6- An introduction that only cites 3 articles doesn't seem serious. 7- your model shown in the figure is not comprehensible. it must be presented with all the components introduced (A, R...). 8- in your analysis you talk about comparison. what are the comparison criteria used (RMSE? precision? speed?...)? 9- you have no table presenting the comparison with several other algorithms. it would be better to present this in a table. 10- What does the development of equation 9 refer to? 11- your way of quoting articles does not match your references 12- did you read this article (Sam et al. (2019)) before quoting it in part 2.3?	

	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:	**Manyol Moise**
Department, University & Country	**University of Douala, Cameroon**