



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_52793
Title of the Manuscript:	Further scalable test functions for multidimensional continuous optimization
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This paper concentrates on the real world optimization problems that emerge from various scientific and engineering fields and are characterized by constraints like complexity, non-linearity etc. Here comes the need for proposals of new optimized algorithms to provide acceptable solutions. The introduction is good and reflects the eagerness of the authors to discuss the above said points. The CGOP problem is next considered along with unconstrained optimization of test functions; same is done for constrained functions too. The conclusion, though a bit short, is acceptable.	I agree, thanks.
Minor REVISION comments	Mathematical/ Stochastic functions, formulae and their implementation are presented in a précised manner. Giving some examples and offering comparisons would have made the paper more precise.	It is not clear for me what the reviewer is asking.
Optional/General comments	NONE	

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)	