

Review Form2

Book Name:	Mathematics and Computer Science - Contemporary Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2159
Title of the Manuscript:	Graph Coloring as a Technique for University Course Timetabling Optimization
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic of university course timetabling holds significant importance for several reasons, involves the intricate scheduling of classes. This paper investigates the use of graph coloring as a technique to optimize this process, aiming to streamline scheduling, minimize conflicts, Stress Reduction, Student Satisfaction, and enhance the overall efficiency of course timetabling in universities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, its suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but somewhat cluttered with technical details. Simplifying it could make it more accessible. For instance, the specific Halstead complexity metrics values might be better placed in the results section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Well structured	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	- In the Review of Related Works section of this manuscript, the authors have reviewed the existing literature. It is recommended that they clarify the deficiencies and shortcomings of previous studies and explain what motivated them to conduct the research presented in this paper. Furthermore, the literature review is extensive, it lacks critical analysis of the cited works. Including a discussion on the limitations or gaps in these studies would provide a stronger foundation for justifying the new approach. - The methodology is well-structured but could be improved by clearly differentiating between the hard and soft constraints in the course conflict graph. Providing explicit examples of how these constraints are applied would add clarity. - Assumptions made for developing the model, such as students not taking more than five courses a day, should be explicitly justified. Explaining why these assumptions are realistic and how they impact the model's applicability in different contexts would be beneficial. - The results should be compared with those from existing studies (Experimental studies) to evaluate and highlight the effectiveness of the method. This comparison will help to identify any improvements or advantages offered by the new method over previous approaches. Additionally, it will provide a clearer understanding of how the method performs in different contexts and validate its efficiency against established benchmarks.	

Review Form2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references used in the manuscript are quite outdated, with some dating back to 2008. To enhance the credibility and relevance of the study, it is strongly recommended to incorporate more recent references. This will not only reflect the latest advancements and discoveries in the field but also place your research within the current context of scientific knowledge.Highlighting recent advances or comparing newer methods could strengthen the argument for the proposed model.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	very strong and well written English	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- Appendix III cited in the paper has not been incorporated into the paper. For a comprehensive understanding, please refer to the supplementary material where Appendix III is detailed. - Figures 4.1 and 4.2 require additional details and commentary. It is recommended to enhance these figures with more comprehensive information and annotations. This will help to clearly convey the intended message and ensure that readers can fully understand the context and significance of the data presented. Additionally, including descriptive captions and explanations will provide better insights into the figures and their relevance to the study.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Garziad Mouad
Department, University & Country	Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Morocco