



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14177
Title of the Manuscript:	Similarity-Based Content Retrieval in Self-Organizing Peer-to-Peer Networks
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	Section 6.1- We suppose this overhead of VTC messages could be reduced. These results shown here are obtained out of the worst cases in the sense that the numbers of VTCs are the largest in these networks. More than one VTC messages from the same peer could be aggregated into a single message. Also, caching of VTC messages could reduce the network traffic. On what grounds is this claim made? More explanations are needed. In general although the related parts are embedded within the text body this paper needs to make a clear section for 'Methodology' and 'Literature review'. Relevant literature has been included; it just needs to be made clearer.	Thank you so much. - We agree. Regarding this third paragraph of Section 6.3, there is no rigorous validation for the claim yet. We deleted this paragraph. - We updated the structures of Sections 3 and 5 to make the literature part and the methodology part clearer as: [Old] 3. Similarity Estimation, 3.1 Folksonomy, and 3.2 Making Virtual Typical Content; [New] 3. Similarity Estimation, 3.1 Related Technology, 3.1.1 Folksonomy, 3.2 Our Method, and 3.2.1 Establishing Virtual Typical Content.
Minor REVISION comments	Referencing needs to be checked- brackets seem to be put in excess. [Sripanidkulchai, et al. (2003)]	- We updated some citations, mostly in Section 2, removing redundant brackets.
Optional/General comments		