



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_15919
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Total Antioxidant Capacity (TAS) by Using Fuzzy Logic
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The introduction gives a detailed description on scientific background, as well as on fuzz logic applications. However, there is a gap between these two portions. A brief introduction on literatures related to computational intelligence with scientific / clinical applications should be given to bridge the knowledge gap. The last paragraph of the introduction mentions that the proposed technique is generic for diagnostic decision, although only one application is demonstrated in this paper. What are the novel parts in ANFIS method? Are there overlaps between ANFIS and existing fuzzy logic-based methods? Writing style needs to be improved to make the method section concise and technical sound. In data and results section, details of the study design are missing. What is the process of patient recruitment? Is ethical approval required / approved? Furthermore, what is the scientific evidence that TAS values can be estimated from SBP, DBP, and age? Are there literatures on this topic? In patient selection, what are the criteria to be chosen for training or testing? For example, are training and testing data randomly selected? Selection bias may exist given a comparable small dataset.	I tried to filled the gap I improved writing style Ethical issues: Data used in this study were taken a previously conducted study at Harran University School of Medicine by Associate Prof. Yusuf Sezen and his friends between 2008 and 2009. Prior to initiating subject recruitment, the study was approved by the local ethics committee of the university, in accordance with the ethical principles for human investigations, as outlined in the second Declaration of Helsinki. In patient selection, I tried to choose patients who have different DBP, SBP and Age to investigate the effect of these on TAS. Therefore, I didn't select just one age, DBP or SBP. I tried to distribute both model and test patient group who has different age, DBP and SBP so that it reflects whole patient groups. I added two new figures that showed percentages



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In Figure 4 and 5, errors are reported as absolute values. It would be more informative to show them in percentage. Discussions are needed to further explain the results and scientific discoveries. Ethical approval is needed to conduct the study. However, this information is missing in the paper.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Section titles should be unified. Overall writing needs to be improved too.	Writing style was improved
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nil.	