



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_7897
Title of the Manuscript:	Centroid -Based and Bayesian Algorithms Performance
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, corrects 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	Contribution of this paper very low. The paper does not offer any new. The paper investigates Bayesian classifier and a graph based centrality algorithms performance on the Arabic news corpus results that are questionable. For example, ROUGE scores for the SBA on the data set are very high. These high scores are questionable to say the least.	I appreciate your view point that makes me learn more and more. I tried to modify the paper in a way that reflects the main goal. The paper objective is to compare the performance between BC and CBA (Centroid-Based Algorithm). So, by implementing both algorithms and evaluating them I found CBA F-scores are higher than BC F-scores. Moreover, I checked the robustness of both CBA and BC; I found that CBA is more robust than BC. So, I concluded that CBA outperforms the BC; which could be a contribution. I would be grateful, if you give me a url of any web site that enables me to learn more in this domain.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) There are many grammatical mistakes. 2) What does SBA mean? 3) Quality of the mathematical formulae given in paper very low. In my opinion, they are copied from other sources. 4) Numbers of formulas repeated (see Sections 3.1 and 4.1	1. I corrected them and I highlighted them and if still there is any more, I will correct them again. 2. Centroid-Based Algorithm CBA is corrected and highlighted. 3. I would be grateful if you give a url of any website or any eBook reference to know the quality formulae in this aspect. 4. Formulae are corrected and highlighted.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In paper reported that "... at the time of writing the query "Text Summarization" in Google returned more than 3,700,000 results (as on 7thOctober 2013 from Google)." Really so? I ask you to check it out!	1. It is checked and found as follows: 4000000 documents. Thank you for your valuable instructions. I tried to implement them and if there is some more to be adjusted, please let me know, to adjust them. With my best regards