



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_11194
Title of the Manuscript:	AN ALTERNATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNIQUE FOR DETECTING OUTLIERS
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The main problem of the paper is the lack of an detailed explanation of the obtained results and its relation to the proposed approach. I suggest to add such discussion at the end of the "5.2 Application and results" section or, maybe better, in a new "5.3 Discussion" section. At the end of the paper it is really important to add such critical considerations about advantages and importance/usability of what is being proposed.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some minor English problems, such as the examples below: "Equivalently after the deletion of one outlier other instance may emerge as an outlier." Correct is: "Equivalently, after the deletion of one outlier, other instance may emerge as an outlier." "...for the given data but it may be more suitable for other data because..." Correct is: "...for the given data. It may be more suitable for other data because..." "So, KSVM used to detect outliers." Correct is: "So, KSVM is used to detect outliers." I suggest an English review before final acceptance.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is well written. The proposed method and its theory are explained in a clear and easy way.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Giampaolo Luiz Libralon
Department, University & Country	Department of Informatics, Federal Institute of Sao Paulo (IFSP) – campus Sao Carlos, SP - Brazil