Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_47983**
Title of the Manuscript:	**SOLVING NURSE SCHEDULING PROBLEM USING CONSTRAINT PROGRAMMING TECHNIQUE**
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	**This paper has a good writing style. However there are Several main issues that must be fixed!** **i) There is no discussion or findings section that reports and interprets the findings of the authors. I.e. the authors have successfully implemented and solved the nurse scheduling problem and used constraint programming however there is no discussion or analysis of the results. This section should come before the conclusion part. (even the conclusion is way too short for this work!) In the conclusions the authors need to clearly state what they have accomplished and what issues still remain!** **ii) Other observations on the paper show that it is not clear from where the data set used for this study was obtained. The way the data is presented in the paper makes it look like the data was invented even though the authors claim that they got the data from 20 nurses from 4 different shifts. Can the authors clarify from where the data was obtained and if it is real data or just test data. I.e. for this problem the authors should try to validate their model using real data or compare it to some real scenario otherwise the results are not so significant.** **iii) Apart from these facts the way the model was chosen is very unclear. Can the authors give more details and explain better.** **iv) The reason for selecting constraint programming is unclear. Can the authors explain the benefits of constraint programming and compare their selection with other models. (Other approaches are not really described in the paper)** **v) When reading the paper it seems that the paper was written quickly without the authors checking it. Even the font size used in the first page where there is the introduction are not consistent.** **vi) There is a serious problem in the paper. Many references used in the reference section are not cited in the paper. These should be cited.** **vii) The limitations of the model that has been used should be clearly stated. I.e. is this model still useful if we have a department with 10,000 employees? Will the constraint programming approach still work! The practical limitations of their model should be stated.** **MORE WORK NEEDS TO BE ADDED. GENERALLY ALL THE SECTIONS OF THE PAPER ARE A BIT TOO SHORT!** **IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE AUTHORS EXPLAIN HOW THEY OBTAINED THE DATA FOR TESTING THEIR MODEL. THE AUTHORS SHOULD STATE WHAT DATA WAS USED AND ITS POSSIBLE PROBLEMS. LIMITATIONS OF THEIR WORK NEED TO BE STATED**	
Minor REVISION comments		

Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Anthony Spiteri Staines*
Department, University & Country	*University of Malta, Malta*