SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2013_BJMCS_5984**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Neural Network Model for Improved Internet Service Resource Provisioning**
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		
Minor REVISION comments	The piece is very interesting and well written. I would only avoid to repeat "Artificial" ANN at line 40. In my opinion, it is better if the author writes the name of the authors he/she quotes instead of for example (2) propose etc.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Raffaela Giovagnoli**
Department, University & Country	**Pontifical Lateran University, Rome, Italy**