



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14339
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPROVING METHOD OF EVALUATING SEMANTIC FILTERING FOR HUMAN COMPUTER INTERACTION IN AN ADAPTIVE COLLABORATIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
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, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In lines 23 and 29, a cited reference does not appear. In line 30 after etc. Is missing a comma. In line 78 is said "Questions were made available and ..." I recommend writing the used questions. The ASF Flowchart design: Can be written as an algorithm and to define all the terms used there and describe its parts. Their contribution is not clear. It should be noted the improved ASF-based method. Line 94 is said: "When compared with the previous database system that encouraged the use of redundancy with no integrity " I recommend cite such database system and the results obtained with this. In line 100 is said "really discourages the redundancy " I recommend explain such assertion.	In lines 23 and 29, a cited reference does not appear. <i>Agreed with reviewer and corrected.</i> In line 30 after etc. Is missing a comma. <i>Agreed with reviewer and corrected.</i> In line 78 is said "Questions were made available and ..." I recommend writing the used questions. <i>Agreed with reviewer and corrected.</i> The ASF Flowchart design: Can be written as an algorithm and to define all the terms used there and describe its parts. Their contribution is not clear. It should be noted the improved ASF-based method. <i>Corrected with the use of pseudocode instead of flowchart.</i> Line 94 is said: "When compared with the previous database system that encouraged the use of redundancy with no integrity " I recommend cite such database system and the results obtained with this. <i>Agreed with reviewer and corrected.</i> In line 100 is said "really discourages the redundancy " I recommend explain such assertion. <i>Agreed with reviewer and Corrected.</i>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think that it is an interesting work, but it is convenient to make clear the contribution and that an interested reader can reproduce it.	