



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Unfortunately, the paper is written in bad English. At times it is so bad, that it is difficult to decipher what the authors intended to say. There are numerous errors in basic verbs, the verb tense, and very strange use of prepositions. Complete rewriting is suggested, including the use of a professional translator if necessary. It is also unsuitable for reading/reviewing. Few examples to illustrate the above points: Basic verbs/tenses: Section 1, first paragraph, lines 2-3: This ideology be reflected through the adage of Vapnik ... Should be: This ideology is/was reflected through the adage of Vapnik ... Page 1, line 4 from the bottom: ... that these two dimension be well known in the seventies ... Should be: ... that these two dimension were well known in the seventies ... Use of prepositions: Section 1, line 2: ... deep and strong background of mathematics.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	100 out of 100 native English speakers would (correctly!) write: ... deep and strong background in mathematics. The issue here is that the authors do not talk about the background of the mathematics itself, but about something/someone with a background in mathematics. Page 1, line 2 from the bottom: ... to find a method clear and specific to how to measure ... Should be: ... to find a method clear and specific on how to measure ... There should be a distinction between: Feathers are specific to the birds among all animals. and Please, be more specific on this topic. Outright meaningless or badly composed sentences: Section 1, line 3: Vapnik (1964) gives a leading Russian school in the field of machine learning. Now, is it the case that Vapnik gives something to the Russian school of machine learning? Or he creates this school, maybe? Or something else? The very next sentence: He has opened new horizons by his work depending on the structure of the machine learning, not the data itself as it was a strong belief in the past. Is the work of Vapnik itself depending on the structure of machine learning? Doubtful at best. Maybe his work focused more on the structure of the	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	machine learning rather than on the data? Did the belief in the past refer to the work of Vapnik or to the approach to studying the machine learning? This sentence raises much more questions than it answers. Page 2, lines 2-3 from the top: This deficit has weakened many of the importance of this theory in practice and application. Here it is very difficult to take a guess what the sentence was intended to mean. The word importance is in singular form and should be in plural following “many”.	
Minor REVISION comments	None.	
Optional/General comments	None.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Canada