SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**Physical Review & Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_PRRI_4043**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Fast and Simple Algorithm for Detecting Large Scale Structures**
Type of the Article	**Case study**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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		
Minor REVISION comments	This paper develops a gravitational potential method (GPM) to find superstructures from large datasets (e.g., SDSS), and shows its reliability in the detection of superclusters using a cluster sample extracted from the GMBCG cluster catalog. It thus should be a worthy contribution to PRRI. I don't think there is anything wrong with the algorithm, but I have a serious concern about the paper in its present form that needs to be addressed prior to publication, however. The GPM is applied to cluster samples rather than galaxy samples. As far as I know, there are several large cluster catalogues, i.e., AMF (Szabo et al. 2011), GMBCG, and WHL09/WHL12 constructed from the SDSS using different algorithms. However, the matched rates of identified clusters are at the levels of 30%-40% among each other. One would expect that the detected superstructures by this method are likely to be significantly different for different cluster catalogues.	

	I am open to changing my mind if the author can convince me that the GPM is really an efficient algorithm for detecting large-scale structures from large galaxy datasets, without strongly dependence on the known cluster samples. Otherwise, I would suggest the author clarify my concern and tone down related words in the text.	
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer