



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6757
Title of the Manuscript:	Dipole-Loaded Monopole Optimized Using VSO

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)

All my comments have been addressed.
Many thanks.
The majority of the comments have been addressed. However I still think that table 3 and 4 should be simplified.

Authors' response to final evaluator's comments

Thank you for your time and effort in reviewing this paper, which are very much appreciated and have resulted in a much better presentation. However, as to Tables 3 & 4, the author respectfully disagrees that they should be further simplified because, in his opinion, they comport with what data typically are included in benchmark testing. As an example, reproduced below is Pehlivanoglu's Table IV (ref. [20] in the paper).

PEHLIVANOGLU: NEW PARTICLE SWARM OPTIMIZATION METHOD

445

TABLE IV
FIRST TEST BUNDLE RESULTS

f	D	c-PSO		w-PSO		g-PSO		cl-PSO		v-PSO	
		Mean	t _{cpu}	Mean	t _{cpu}	Mean	t _{cpu}	Mean	t _{cpu}	Mean	t _{cpu}
f ₁	10	0.1040±0.0659	1.612	2.5e-15±9.9e-17	1.5219	3.258e-4±4.5e-5	1.634	0.186±0.077	27.49	1.84e-15±2.9e-16	1.717
	20	1.7684±0.2544	1.964	0.0231±0.0322	1.7922	0.0013±1.8e-4	1.95	1.458±0.475	51.33	2.84e-15±1.5e-16	1.957
	30	3.8334±0.3806	2.406	0.0266±0.0374	2.163	0.0027±3.7e-4	2.307	0.972±0.286	76.59	4.93e-15±3.4e-16	2.296
f ₂	10	-0.9483±0.0158	1.557	-0.9970±0.0041	1.4688	-0.9998±3.1e-5	1.568	-1±0.21e-15	28.90	-1±0	1.644
	20	-1.533±0.0485	1.938	-1.9512±0.0162	1.74	-1.9979±2.1e-4	1.883	-2±0.902e-9	51.65	-2±0	1.921
	30	-2.0261±0.0692	2.318	-2.8167±0.0286	2.11	-2.9942±5.1e-4	2.255	-3±0.468e-6	94.12	-3±0	2.26
f ₃	10	-1±2.2e-18	1.468	-1±0	1.371	-1±1.5e-6	1.422	-1±1.82e-17	26.53	-1±0	1.55
	20	-1±2.15e-17	1.78	-1±1.7e-17	1.593	-0.9999±9.2e-6	1.625	-1±1.62e-11	50.86	-1±3e-18	1.771
	30	-1±5.14e-14	2.136	-1±5.4e-18	1.877	-0.9998±1.9e-5	1.901	-1±0.81e-8	75.31	-1±1e-17	2.039
f ₄	10	0.0915±0.0093	2.174	0.0742±0.0075	2.075	0.0549±0.0046	2.125	0.020±0.002	27.89	0.020±0.006	2.251
	20	0.0586±0.0478	2.577	0.0291±0.005	2.396	0.0222±0.0041	2.483	0.0059±0.001	52.67	0.0026±0.002	2.553
	30	0.2238±0.1616	3.043	0.0153±0.0035	2.835	0.0166±0.004	2.946	0.0156±0.002	77.76	8.8568e-4±0.001	2.991
f ₅	10	8.6760±0.7852	2.133	5.1837±0.5259	2.055	0.0398±0.0389	2.111	1.19e-9±7.37e-10	27.26	0±0	2.21
	20	33.4849±2.1134	2.635	23.7496±1.6545	2.483	2.8259±0.6476	2.537	5.2±0.496	53.65	0±0	2.621
	30	84.6011±4.6683	3.146	53.5088±2.5935	3.004	14.1188±2.24	3.033	36.76±1.16	76.21	5.6843e-16±1e-15	3.068
f ₆	10	836.04±61.8981	2.732	442.7311±59.72	2.185	815.1561±64.3	2.232	2.78±3.44	26.11	620.8131±50.4	2.371
	20	2.575e+3±112.69	4.222	2.1577e+3±101	3.093	2.1798e+3±120.9	3.021	1.69e3±39.98	51.78	1.3384e+3±68.5	3.128
	30	4.146e+3±177.38	5.451	3.62e+3±158.35	3.945	3.47e+3±149.3	3.781	4.67e3±93.70	77.31	2.1395e+3±103.3	3.971

His table is typical of the literature, and it includes essentially the same information as Tables 3 & 4 in the paper, viz, function designation, dimensionality, mean fitness, and CPU time. Tables 3 & 4 contain these same data with one addition, the known test function maximum, which makes it easier for the reader to see how well the various algorithms perform relative to that known maximum. Note that CPU time in Pehlivanoglu's table measures computational efficiency, which in Tables 3 & 4 is measured by the number of function evaluations. Thus, Tables 3 & 4 reflect what is common in the literature, perhaps even expected, and, accordingly, in the author's opinion they should not be changed.