



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_12256
Title of the Manuscript:	Discovery of Novel Association Rules Based on Genetic Algorithms
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 <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	The author should answer the following question before the paper is accepted: What is the difference between this paper with the existing papers such as : 1) Kaya M, Alhajj R. Genetic algorithm based framework for mining fuzzy association rules[J]. Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 2005, 152(3): 587-601. 2) Yan X, Zhang C, Zhang S. Genetic algorithm based strategy for identifying association rules without specifying actual minimum support[J]. Expert Systems with Applications, 2009, 36(2): 3066-3076. 3) Kaya M. Multi-objective genetic algorithm based approaches for mining optimized fuzzy association rules[J]. Soft Computing, 2006, 10(7): 578-586. 4) Salleb-Aouissi A, Vrain C, Nortet C. QuantMiner: A Genetic Algorithm for Mining Quantitative Association Rules[C]//IJCAI. 2007, 7. 5) Saggar M, Agrawal A K, Lad A. Optimization of association rule mining using improved genetic algorithms[C]//Systems, Man and Cybernetics, 2004 IEEE International Conference on. IEEE, 2004, 4: 3725-3729.	The approach of the existing 5 papers have been studied and presented in the literature review of our paper. Further, we consider the differences between them with the proposed approach and they used as references for our paper (see references no. [22], [23], [24], [25] and [26]).
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		