



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_10472
Title of the Manuscript:	Multi-Clustering gives robustness to modules in networks
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	1) The contributions of paper are interesting. Sections of 'simulation protocol', 'Illustration on a Protein-Protein Interaction network' and experiments are insufficient to support results and abstract of paper. 2) The reference paper should be added in order to compare different methods or to point out the advantage of paper's method.	1) For the section "Simulation Protocol", what do you mean by insufficient. Simulation with larger graphs, or other densities ? About the Illustration on a protein-protein network, you are right and I have erased this section which deserve much more explanations. 2) I suppose it is the Gambette-Guenoche RAIRO article which is easy to find on the net.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) The graphic or photo seem less in the paper, some results are not easy to perceived. 2) The relationship between sections of paper should be considered when revising this paper	1) You right, graphical results are easy to read, but Table 1 is not large. The main thing to see is the better values of Pcons compared to Pini. 2) A new paragraph summerizing the different sections has been added
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is good paper; some works of authors are creative.	