SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_38361**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Reducing the Cost of Exploring Neighborhood Areas in Dynamic Local Search for SAT**
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	As general, this paper provides a research work in which a stochastic local search (SLS) based approach has been provided for the problem of reducing the cost of exploring neighbourhood areas in dynamic local search for SAT. In detail, the paper provides information on the background, formed intelligent approach and findings – results obtained with this research work. The paper seems having a remarkable subject and research effort. But before it can be published in the CJAST, the following major revisions should be done: 1- The Abstract seems a little longer. It should be shortened. 2- The citing order should be numerically increasing (as [1],[2],[3]…etc.) and currently, it is wrong. That should be fixed. 3- There is no Conclusion and Future Work section of the paper. That should be provided. At this point, some explanations from the section regarding results and analysis may be useful. 4- There seem no explanations regarding future work. If there is any future work thought by the author(s), that should be discussed under the last section of Conclusions and Future Work (which will be added). 5- Currently, total number of references is low. There should be around at least 25-30 references for such paper. In order to keep the content up-to-date and improve general quality, there should be also some more recent references from 2015, 2016, and 2017. Thanks the author(s) for their valuable efforts to form this paper.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	-	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Utku Kose***
Department, University & Country	***Dept. of Computer Engineering, Suleyman Demirel University, Turkey***