



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_19994
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving Adequacy in Rule Based English to Igala Automatic Translation System Through Word Sense Disambiguation
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are many grammatical, style, and format errors that make the manuscript difficult to read in some places. The first sentence in the Abstract contains errors, for example. Another example is the last sentence of the Abstract: "The level of adequacy increased 32% to 69.6%." This should be "The level of adequacy increased FROM 32% to 69.6%" (a completely different meaning). The text should be edited better. Poor editing casts doubt on the reliability of the entire paper. Page 7, evaluation. More details are needed. Who did the evaluation? There should be at least two independent raters with correlation measures. Pages 7-9. The paper mentions that the quality was judged based upon adequacy and fluency, but only adequacy scores are given.	Observation on grammatical style and format errors were noted and necessary corrections have been done. Additional evaluation was carried out by an independent evaluator as recommended. Adequacy computation was based on the average. We did not include fluency rating because our focus was on adequacy; we have noted your observation and included it.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The database table descriptions on pages 4 and 5 are not necessary. There is no need to discuss different types of database models. Actually, the data does not even need to	The discussion on database models and table structures has been removed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	be stored in a database. Figure 3, page 7: I believe this is a poor example. There is a distinct difference between a watch and a clock (unless the same word is used for both in Igala, in which case, a different example should be used). Pages 5-7. I would like to see the translation of an case English sentence, showing every step of the process. Table 4. Because most of the journal's readers do not speak Igala, it would be useful to give literal translations for the 'previous' and 'current' MT examples to English. Thus, readers can judge for themselves how much improvement was made. The calculation of adequacy performance at the bottom of page 8 is not necessary. Just state the result.	The example has been changed. The steps in the translation of English sentence to Igala are illustrated in the flow chart in figure 3. The output design was modified to show some of the operations in the translation process. The literal translation is provided in the output. The calculation has been removed. Only the result is stated.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I believe the paper is novel in that few machine translation systems are available for Igala. However, it is just a matter of time before Google Translate supports it. GT already supports Igbo, a closely related language. I believe machine learning is superior to rule-based approaches. Bottom, page 5: caseConverter. Converting everything to lower case eliminates proper nouns, and thus, some meaning.	The choice of technology for developing machine translation application depends on several factors, e.g availability of parallel corpora, moreover each technology has its strengths and weaknesses. Several factors were considered before the choice of rule base was adopted. It is the most suitable approach for the situation. Case conversion does not affect proper nouns. The initial letters of proper nouns were capitalized in the bilingual dictionary table in the database.
---	--	--