



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_15919
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Total Antioxidant Capacity (TAS) by Using Fuzzy Logic
Type of the Article	Research

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	1. In this paper, the authors have predicted the TAS using SBP, DBP and Age as predictors. Have u taken written consent of the subjects before measurement of BP. Please mention it in your manuscript. Please write clearly in the introduction how TAS can affect SBP and DBP. And what is the relationship between age and TAS. How much work has been done in this context? Which techniques have been used till now for the prediction of TAS ? Please write it clearly in the intro section . 2. Please provide the details of data collection methodology. It may help the other researchers to reproduce the experiment. 3. Multicollinearity should not be present among the predictors (show it in your results). If it exists, then remove it first. 4. Please write the units of SBP, DBP,...TAS etc in Table 1. 5. In Table 2, present the value of Coefficient of determination R^2, mean absolute percentage error for all the fuzzy models. Also provide the graphical representation of MAP(actual vs predicted for the best model) 6. Please show the parameters of the best fuzzy model.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7. Compare your results (in Tabular form) with the authors who have used other modelling techniques for the prediction of TAS (please use the latest references). Ethical issues: Yes, written consent of subjects has not been taken before measurement of BP.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Define an abbreviation at its first use. 2. Check your paper for grammatical errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	India