



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_29238
Title of the Manuscript:	Empirical Performance of Internal Sorting Algorithm
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are no sufficient details on C++ time function that you used. You have not given much details on internal and external sorting algorithms yet they are front and centre in your work The literature review should give a critical analysis of existing work and logically situate your work. Your literature review is more of a literature summary. Show exactly where data came from and necessary references. The citations are not in order. Check entire manuscript. The references are not uniformly written according to acceptable style. See Ref [18] and many others.	C++ time function has been included as suggested. The study focuses on internal sorting algorithms, external sorting algorithm was mentioned to show its existence. The literature review now includes critical analysis of existing work as suggested. Addition made where data came from. Citation reordered. Citation now uniformly written.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		