



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_10027
Title of the Manuscript:	TRACE -BASED MODEL FOR KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION SYSTEM
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	From my point of view, yes. Authors seem not familiar with the basic research methodology. I am a researcher published over 20 international journal papers and from my point of view the quality of this paper does not even reach the level of an average conference paper. In the conclusion section, authors mentioned a software called WEKA without any reference. If the system is written by the authors, they should at least mention it somewhere in the text. If the system is NOT written by the authors, authors should not talk about it in the conclusion section and should provide a proper reference. Many figures and table are copied from other unrelated paper. Ex: Figure 3 is copied from presentation slides and the focus of that presentation has no relationship with this study. Authors use the term “context-aware” with a totally different meaning from this research community. There are many tools we can use to describe the architecture of a system, e.g. UML, ANSI flowchart. Authors should use these tools to redraw Figure 2. Authors claim their work can be utilized in firms, societies or even in individuals' life events without providing any concrete evident. The section 2 is organized as same as one of the referenced paper. But this section “Methodology” should	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	be something new rather than dumping copied sentences and figures. The English should be reviewed by a native speaker. There are too many grammar errors and some sentences even do not have subject.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Many sentences are copied from other literatures without proper citation. For example, at line 156 and 157, these sentences are word-by-word copied from other's paper. Authors should, at least, place the sentences in double-quote. But this kind of thing should not happen in a journal paper. Many unrelated texts, figures, tables are copied from others work.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer