



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_7897
Title of the Manuscript:	Centroid -Based and Bayesian Algorithms Performance
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	1. What is the algorithm for the proposed method of graph-based classification ? 2. Is GBA robust when compared with BC that shown in Figure 9 ? Why GBA can obtain high score for reference set 4 ?	1. It is Centroid –Based Algorithm(C BA). It is corrected and highlighted. It also, expressed in another way. 2. I repeat the test process and I checked the robustness. CBA is a robust; the result is written is highlighted as well. It could be related to the high recall that represents the important information omitted from machine summary. Also, the selection of s1 to s2 was randomly from the corpus that may reflect the lock of similarity between the centroid sentence and others around it.
Minor REVISION comments	1. What is the context of CBA and ID8 for Arabic and English competition that implemented in [15] for comparison that shown in Figure 6 and 7 ? Is the comparison based on the same corpus ?	1. The context of CBA is written in section 3 along with BC. The ID8 is a baseline which is mentioned in [15]. Yes such data provided by Linguistics Data Consortium at the Penn University
Optional/General comments	1. Authors should address something that the proposed GBA can outperform other method for some kind of text summarization according to the results shown in figure 9 as the contribution of this study. 2. The format of this manuscript is difficult to read.	1. I made it, also, I highlighted it, in the manuscript. 2. I follow the journal instructions in formatting of this article. I would be grateful, if you send me a guideline or a url of any web site to learn how to make the paper easy to read. Thank you for your valuable instructions. I hope that I corrected my paper as you mentioned. Please, let me know if the paper requires more modification, I will make it. With my best regards