



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_61487
Title of the Manuscript:	Meta-Heuristic Solutions to a Student Grouping Optimization Problem faced in Higher Education Institutions
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Subject: In this article, the student grouping problem is studied and some meta-heuristic methods are compared to find a more efficient algorithm. It is a classic problem and there is not any innovation in problem definition, but the comparison of the efficiency of the known methods for a specific problem is interesting.</p> <p>The article also suffers the following weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Lack of literature review and previous-work study. A complete section is needed to be included in the revised manuscript to cover this issue. 2- More related papers about the university timetabling and student grouping should be added to the research. 3- The place of the title of the tables and figures is wrong and reversed. The title of the tables must be inserted on top and the tile of the figures should be under it. 4- There are lots of grammatical and structural problems in the text, it is suggested to revise and spell-check the text by some applications like Grammarly. 5- Some repetitive words are typed in the text, e.g. "the the allowed limit (13)" in section 3.1 (proposition 3.1). 6- The simulation software environment and the parameters tuning method is not known. 7- In the "Results and Discussion" section, the comparison criteria and concept of the numbers given in the tables 5,6 and 7 are not defined and described clearly and precisely. 8- The word "ants" in "ants colony optimization" should be written as "Ant". <p>Review result: Major Revision Considering the mentioned problems, I suggest Major Revision for this manuscript.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Related work section has now been added. 2. More references has been added to the related work section. Also an elaborate recent survey on meta-heuristic solutions to solving the University Timetabling problems has been added. 3. Tables titles have been rearranged. 4 and 5. Manuscript has been proofread to fix grammatical errors. 6. Abstract now includes that algorithms were implemented in Python programming language. Sections on ant colony optimization and genetic algorithm now state parameters that could be tuned. Conclusions now states that parameters in this study were manually tuned but a more effective tuning approach may result in better performance. 7. Now stated that values in table 5, 6, 7 indicate the fitness of solutions after 10 runs. And that quality was computed through a fitness function. 8. Occurrences of "ants" have been corrected to "ant".
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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