



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMCS_17980
Title of the Manuscript:	The law of large numbers. A multicriterial analysis
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-The author should consider revising the English used in Remark 1, the last part of theorem 5 and the first statement in the conclusion for clarity purposes. -Remark 2 is also not clear -The sentence above fig. 3 should also be revised as it is not clear in its current form.	I took a look and I modified as I could. I hope you understand now what I want to explain in the two remarks. Remark 1. The first statement of the Bernoulli theorem approach is theoretical justification made between the concepts of relative frequency and probability of an event. It expresses the fact that for very large strings evidence any significant difference between the relative frequency and probability of an event is very improbable. So convergence of relative frequencies to probability of the event it does not to be understood as a common numerical convergence. It is not apparent from the above theorem and is not accepted the intuitive idea that with increasing number of relative samples frequency values are necessarily closer to probability. Remark 2. The two formulations result one of the other if we consider the absolute frequency of realization of A in n samples. Let X_n be a random variable distributed $B_i(n, p)$. For the sentence above fig. 3, I explained better:



SDI Review Form 1.6

		The γ_i weighting coefficients can be calculated with different formulas. We chose to use FRISCO practice formula (empirical formula given by a renowned creative group from San Francisco – US) that has been recognized worldwide as being the most performance and is long used. Therefore, with, $\gamma_i = \frac{p + \Delta p + m + 0,5}{-\Delta p' + \frac{N_{crt}}{2}}$ where • p is the sum of points obtained (on line) of the considered element • Δp the difference between the score of the considered element and the score at the top level element; if the element taken into account is the one located on the top floor, results Δp with the value 0 • m the number of outclassed criteria (exceeded from terms of score) the by the criteria taken into account • N_{crt} the number of considered criterion • $\Delta p'$ the difference between the score of the considered element and the score of the first element (resulting with a negative value); taken into account if the item is located on the first level, $\Delta p'$ results with the value 0
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		It is noted that the main diagonal of the array contains only quadratic criteria for scoring 1/2 values because no criteria may be more important or less important than the criteria itself.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-This is a good paper. The paper contributes a lot of knowledge in the field of Statistics(Measure theory)	Thank you