



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_15619
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Learning under Uncertainty Based on Dempster-Shafer Approach for Minimizing True Error of Machine Learning
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	1. The authors claimed that DSCML performs better than other machine learning methods including TCML but failed to explain the reasons from the algorithm perspective. The two illustration boxes for the algorithm failed to clarify this. If the first stage of DSCML is to run the TCML, how could it be possible to save CPU time with the added second stage? 2. The result comparisons should be done in more appropriate way, such Cross-validation Error Rate since the authors used 10 fold cross validation. A ROC curve plot may be proper. 3. It would be helpful for the author to make the method publically available so that the other researchers would be able to repeat and verify the results. But the paper failed to mention the software package, code or programming language used in this study. 4. Sections 4.2, 4.3, 5 and 6 should be significantly expanded to discuss the results in a more professional way. The current writing is over simplified and did not touch much on the data/results. 5. The formula in the section "2. Dempster-Shafer Evidence Theories" is wrong (Tazid Ali et al. 2012). In the denominator of the SECOND part, it should be "$= \Phi$" instead of "$\neq$". 6. In the text of same section, "$m(\Phi)$" should be "$m(X)$". 7. The title of Table 5 is copied from Table 4 and is not correctly describing the content.	
Minor REVISION comments	The writing, typesetting and formatting could be done more professionally. 1. In the section 3 "The Proposed Approach Dempster...", the text in the two boxes should be corrected, such as the "<" sign, "machine learning I" to "machine learning i". There are more similar mistakes. There are	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	two different colours for the text. 2. The steps in these two boxes should be numbered correctly. There are two “9” steps in the first box and two “5” steps in the second box. 3. The Greek letter in the text (and in other parts of the manuscript) should be formatted or inserted correctly. 4. The font, size, and colour of the text in Table 2 are not consistent. Similar problems exist in other tables. 5. Again, the text font and size should be consistent in ALL the tables. 6. There are too many typos and grammar errors in the writing. To name a few: a. “...performanceof” to be “performance of” in the Abstract. b. Page 2: “... of the approximation and.” “ and” should be removed. c. Page 3: “... the data sets usedsimulation...” to be “... the data sets used simulation ...” d. Page 3: “The real benefit is generated from multiple sources are presenting different ...” to be “The real benefit generated from multiple sources are presenting different ...”? Remove “is”? e. Page 3: “The fundamental assumption of the Dempster – Shafer theory that sources are used to be independent.” Is this a legal sentence? Notice the space before the “-”. f. Section 6 “Conclusion”: “This Paper is considered the pioneer paper that introducing” to be “This paper is considered the pioneer paper that introduces...”? Notice the capital “P” in “Paper”. “The comparative results on six benchmarking problems are done indicate to highly ...”; “are done” should be removed??? There are many such errors.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is definitely not ready for publication yet, both the science and the writing or grammar and formatting. It looks the author never read it after finish the writing. The authors could have done much better work before the submission. The reviewer is not aware of any plagiarism. However, for some references, the reviewer is no able to access the full paper, such as the TCML paper (Zaher et al. 2013) which is one of the most important citations.	
--	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	USA