



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_25080
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPEMENT OF ANT COLONY COMPUTER-AIDED OPTIMIZATION SOFTWARE AS A DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM USING VISUAL BASIC STUDIO
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>)



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	1. Title should be changed, for example to 'Development of an Ant colony optimization software as a solid waste management system' 2. Introduction section should be rewritten. No relative literature is described and discussed. 3. In flowchart of Figure 1 'Yes' and 'No' directions are missing from decision nodes. 4. Which is the exact stopping f the ACO algorithm? 5. Figure 2 is not needed. 6. It is expected that the proposed system performs better than manual calculation. The authors should compare their system with another system or algorithm to prove its efficiency. 7. You should also apply your system to solve problem instances already solved and reported by other papers in the respective literature. 8. Section 4 presents many Figures but has little explanation of respective results. More discussion should be added concerning the advantages, the applicability and the efficiency of the proposed system.	1) Title has been changed as suggested. 2) A total of 10No. references were cited in Introduction only and discussed; this should be considered sufficient enough. 3) As per the flow chart, the "Yes"or "No" options has been incorporated it was just an omission! 4) The specified error margin or the number of iterations are two options to stop the ACO program. 5) Figure 2 has been deleted as suggested. 6) An Evolutionary Algorithm from Microsoft Excel 2013 was employed to resolve the University of Port Harcourt four campus segments problem and results compared as shown in Table 5 and Figures 11a- d. The result showed



SDI Review Form 1.6

		that the proposed model compared favorably with the results of the evolutionary algorithm and as the advantage of small number of iterations for convergence and early stability. 7) Our response is same as question 6 above, please see Tables 5 and Figures 11a-d. 8) Section 4 covers Results and Discussion, additional explanations are made and shown in yellow. The advantages of the proposed model are fully highlighted in the Results, Discussion and Conclusion.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		