



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10707
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficient Frequent Pattern Mining using Auto-Associative Memory Neural Network
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Please give some background on Apriori algorithm, the same as you did for FP-growth! 2. You presented the experimental results. You should also discuss them. 3. Your proposed method is relatively better than FP-growth for mushroom dataset (Fig. 2). However, it is likely comparable with FP-growth for the case of chess dataset (Fig. 3). There must be limitations in your algorithm. You should describe them.	We have modified manuscript as per the comments. Brief background on Apriori algorithm is given. Experimental results are discussed in more detail. The chess dataset is relatively dense compared to mushroom dataset. In spite of this comparable results are obtained. We do not think algorithm has got limitations.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The words used in the entire manuscript (including tables and figures) should be consistent. E.g. "auto-associative" vs "auto associative", "FP-growth" vs "FP Growth", ... 2. In Fig. 2 and 3, name of horizontal and vertical axis should be given.	Modifications have been made as per the comments.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Information on some references is incomplete. E.g. 12 (journal, conference proceedings ...?), 21 (no year) 2. About 86% of cited papers are published before 2010. Please cite recent publications if possible!	Complete information in references is added.