



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_BJMCS_6023
Title of the Manuscript:	Karnaugh Map Approach for Mining Frequent Termset from Uncertain Textual Data
Type of the Article	Short Research Paper

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	It appears that this paper may present a significant result which is worthy of journal publication. However, this is obscured by a lot of major issues with the paper. First and foremost, there are two problems with the result as it is presented. The description of the method for the other algorithms is insufficient to allow duplication/assessment. It is necessary to convince the reader that you have not created a 'straw man' argument (a presentation where you compare your approach to an inferior version of another knowing that it will win). I'm not saying that this is what has occurred – just that there is insufficient explanation to allow the reader to judge this. Second, this paper was really not ready for review from a English and formatting perspective. There are numerous areas where the writing is unclear or very awkwardly worded, making the meaning unintelligible. There are	We compared our algorithm and their performance with the state-of-the-art frequent itemset mining algorithm for uncertain textual data sets. In all cases the performance of our algorithm found to be encouraging because this approach requires only one pass of database scan. Thus. It reduces I/O time as well as CPU time. UApriori required n-1 (where n is number of items) time scanning of database and UFP-growth required two times scan of the database to generate frequent patterns. Chui C K. et. al. proposed mining frequent itemset from uncertain data [10] in 2007. They proposed the U-Apriori algorithm, which was a modified version of the Apriori algorithm, which works on such datasets. Leung C K S. et. al. proposed Efficient mining of frequent patterns from uncertain data [25] in 2007. In this paper they proposed tree-based mining algorithm (UFP-growth) to efficiently find frequent patterns from uncertain data, 2. Yes I redefine language and convert paper in your SDI format. Corrected parts are highlighted.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	also a large number of places where spaces are missing ("word[]word"), etc. The author/authors is/are suggested to have this paper reviewed by someone more fluent in English or an editing service. The primary thesis of this paper is based on an assertion that the number of scans required serves as a metric for the evaluation of the compared techniques. It is unclear from the paper whether this is the number of scans required to produce a constant level of quality or if quality fluctuates between the various approaches / number of scans. If the quality is constant, this should be explicitly stated. If not, quality data should be presented I would like to stress that this paper could be very good if these issues are corrected. While there are a lot of problems at present, they may not require a whole lot of work to resolve (as most are writing presentation issues, presuming that data exists regarding quality, etc.).	3. Before construct the k-map, it can only one time database scan and generate table 6, table 7 and table 8.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The literature survey should indicate (either for each prior work discussed, or in a summary paragraph, etc.) what the relevance of the work is and either how it has impacted the current work or the current work improves on / responds to a problem with the prior work.	Yes, i have added some more information.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I have made a number of notes on the attached manuscript indicating areas that are unclear, etc. while reviewing. Please note that this does NOT include all of the English / writing issues with the paper; however, it does indicate some areas which caused particular confusion.	Yes I redefine language. Corrected part are highlighted.



SDI Review Form 1.6