



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17678
Title of the Manuscript:	Arabic Text Summarization using Latent Semantic Analysis
Type of the 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This is an encouraged research result. However, the type setting is not suitable for a Journal paper. Many of the symbols are not defined properly. The score used in Table 2 is not clearly statement. The value of Rouge-2 of T2 stated in text is not consisted with that of Table 6. Some comments and discussion should be given for the results. It is suggested to compare with other methods.	Thank you very much for encouragement. I appreciate your positive comments, in fact, I learned from your instructions; also, my desire is to learn from others. On the basis of your instructions: 1. I corrected the score used in Table 2. 2. I corrected Rouge-2 of T₂ and became consisted with Table 6. 3. My work can be compared with the work indicated by reference 3. But I used different variations of the word such as root, stem and the original word rather than the word only as he did. Therefore, the comparison will be nonsense because I implemented the root model and he implemented the original word in addition to different data sets used by the two different experiments. 4. Unfortunately, I could not understand Your comment stated above: "... However, the type setting is not suitable for a Journal paper..." . Could you please tell me in more details about the suitable and standards setting types of a journal? If I got the idea I will implement it in re-writing the manuscript. I am sorry to bother you by my questions.