



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_16570
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Algorithm based on K-means-Clustering Technique for Multi-objective Resource Allocation Problems
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	I do believe that this study advances the field of research, but there are a number of points that need further clarifications to the reader's benefits. Below are these points listed in order of importance. 1. The readability of this paper requires improving. I have difficulty following the text. The whole text should have been paragraphed properly. In the current form, the entire text appears as a big lump, impairing its readability substantially. 2. The abstract unclear please rewrite abstract 3. The literature review on the recent progress for this research topic is not sufficient. 4. Please better clarify of Figure 2, 3 and 4 as it is the kernel of this work 5. The conclusion unclear please rewrite conclusion 6. There must be a comparison between the previous work and work search	Thank you for your valuable comments, 1. All the manuscript was revised carefully 2. The abstract was revised 3. Literature survey was updated and the introduction was rewritten. "highlighted in the text" 4. Figures 2, 3, 4 were clarified. 5. The conclusion was revised. 6. The comparison was made with the state-of-the-art results, for test problem 1 in figure (11) and the lines 448 to 450, and for test problem 2 in figure 12 and the lines 482 to 487 "highlighted in the text"



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		