



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_10027
Title of the Manuscript:	TRACE -BASED MODEL FOR KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION SYSTEM
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	– There is a strong need for extensive editing of English language and style as in many points the manuscript is incomprehensible and complicated. – The description of the methodology adopted needs to be clarified and better organized. – From the abstract, it seems that the proposed model will be applied in the case of hospital disaster preparedness (evaluation and analysis) but there is not a case study in the manuscript concerning the issue. – I have a sense that the structure of the manuscript should be more coherent. – In some points, the information presented seems to be very general and not focused on the specific topic the manuscript deals with. – In line 40, a definition of Case-Based Reasoning is given. Should it be followed by a respective reference? – In subsection 2.2, it is mentioned that six factors will be described but only five of them are finally presented. What about the sixth factor? (The numbering of the following subsections should also be corrected, i.e. 2.2.1, 2.2.2 etc.). – The data presented in Table 5 are not visible. Maybe the analysis should be of higher quality. – In some cases, the term 'member functions' is used instead of 'membership functions'. It needs to be corrected. – The idea of structuring a neuro-fuzzy model for knowledge evaluation is very interesting as such a model could be applied in several cases.	>> Please check the new model structure and more details and equations have been added in Methodology subsection especially in Inference network. >> Because it's been listed as a place of study and it might be also other cases of study to be applied for this model. >> For Manuscript coherence issue, more details have been added for more clarification. >> Please consider Review 3A for Case Based Reasoning Definition reference. >> Sorry for this mistake,, now added the sixth factor plus the amendment for the subsections has been done. >> Table 5 is more visible now, hopefully. >> Member function words are corrected. >> Thank you for your encouragement.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The goal of the study might be further clarified. I think that it should be clear that a model for knowledge evaluation will be presented. (If this is the main goal of the study).	>> Please consider Review 3B and Methodology subsection.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	– Maybe, the title should be more specific and imply somehow that the proposed model focuses on knowledge evaluation. – In Table 6 where ‘Model Specifications’ are described, it may be useful information of ‘what’ each model represents to be added in a separate column.	>> The Title has been amended.