



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_12020
Title of the Manuscript:	Model selection of stochastic simulation algorithm based on generalized divergence measures
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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	It is very difficult to read and understand this paper because of poor English writing. - Plenty of spelling and orthographic errors - Lack of relation between paragraphs - Informal expressions, for example, "a brand of efficiency", "a good strategy simulation", "we do discussion", "threerof", "data data processing"... Lack of previous works makes difficult to decide of the novelty of this paper. - This paper cites several references but not explained well, some of "References" have no title. This paper is a kind of review paper since it compares existing simulation methods using existing and well-known metrics, therefore I cannot accept it is a noble in its approach and contribution. What makes the matter worse, it is not much useful as a review paper to the journal readers. The paper confusingly mixes their works and the previous work done by the others by describing "we" everywhere.	We considered the remark about spelling mistakes and some badly written sentences and we made corrections. Previous work on the topic discussed by our article is made by Chauveau and Vandekerckhove (2007) in their paper titled "How to compare MCMC simulation strategies." These authors have used the Kullback divergence to compare simulation strategies. The contribution of our paper is the proposition of generalized divergence measures (the α-divergence $R\alpha(p,q)$, $T\alpha(p,q)$ and $D\alpha(p,q)$) for comparing simulation strategies. The manuscript was substantially revised: the Abstrat and the Introduction are rewritten and changed. The sections Estimators of divergence measure and Methodology (Section 2.2 and Section 2.3) have been modified with more explanations. The outline also has been slightly modified.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		