



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCOS_54901</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>OPTIMIZATION OF MULTI-PRODUCTS DISTRIBUTION BY TABU SEARCH ALGORITHM (Case Study: Fuel Distribution)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case study</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	One suggestion: It is better to write [23]-[28] than the [23][13][24][25][26][27][28], for all situations in the manuscript like this that I mentioned. Language issue: "cannot" instead of "can not". Also, double space is occurred in the paper, please remove unnecessary space in those cases. Results: Data availability missed. All the data must be public, available for other researchers. So, publish your data online, on public Google drive link, or better on some research data centers, like "4TU.Centre for Research Data", available on link <a href="https://researchdata.4tu.nl/en/">https://researchdata.4tu.nl/en/</a>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This paper " OPTIMIZATION OF MULTI-PRODUCTS DISTRIBUTION BY TABU SEARCH ALGORITHM (Case Study: Fuel Distribution) " is well-structured, with great explanation of every segment. Introduction and Related work sections are really good, and the references in those two sections are relatively new (most of them are in the last several years, which is good). MATERIAL AND METHODS / EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS / METHODOLOGY section is well describer, with a great Figure 1 presented as flow diagram. Section RESULTS is concise, but well-written. Conclusions: Well concluded  Based on all of these comments, for me this paper is very good with interesting idea, and it should be accepted with including all the mentioned (Minor) suggestions.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Emir Žunić</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>