



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. There are some typo and grammar errors in the manuscript that needs to be revised carefully throughout the paper. Such as in abstract: "having a edge" 2. The motivation of is not clear enough. The authors mentioned the similar methods such as Bootstrap clustering and consensus clustering. Actually, there are still other similar approaches. The authors need to give more reasons for the proposed method and what are the main problems the current work exist. From the current manuscript, it looks like the method combines the two existing work with slight improvement. 3. As the authors proposed in the manuscript, the problem to maximize $M(P)$ is NP-hard. They found an sub-optimal solution. The performance evaluations need to be made about the performance ratio. 4 In simulation part, the authors made comparisons with method proposed by Hubert & Arabie, 1985. The work seem not new. Suggest the authors to make comparisons with the state-of-the-art research.	1) I have carefully read again my manuscript and I have made many changes. 2) My motivation is to evaluate the robustness of clusters and partitions of a graph vertices. We made a first method of bootstrap clustering generating several graphs similar to the given one, depending on parameters. This new method, using a randomized algorithm allows to avoid parameter estimations. 3) Considering the size of networks, an optimal solution cannot be computed and so a performance ratio. But the important point is to perform better with multi clustering than with a single run. 4) There is a huge literature on indices to compare partitions, and I have also contributed to. According to me, the Rank Index corrected by chance remains the best one, and it is very classical in Classification
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. There are some typo and grammar errors in the manuscript that needs to be revised carefully throughout the paper. Such as in abstract: "having a edge" 2. The motivation of is not clear enough. The authors mentioned the similar methods such as Bootstrap clustering and consensus clustering. Actually, there are still other similar approaches. The authors need to give more reasons for the proposed method and what are the main problems the current work exist. From the current manuscript, it looks like the method combines the two existing work with slight improvement. 3. As the authors proposed in the manuscript, the problem to maximize $M(P)$ is NP-hard. They found an sub-optimal solution. The performance evaluations need to be made about the performance ratio. 4 In simulation part, the authors made comparisons with method proposed by Hubert & Arabie, 1985. The work seem not new. Suggest the authors to make comparisons with the state-of-the-art research.	Identical comments .. and Identical answers
---	---	---