



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	2015_PSIJ_16503
Title of the Manuscript:	A METHOD FOR COMPUTING INITIAL APPROXIMATIONS FOR A 3-PARAMETER EXPONENTIAL FUNCTION
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This paper proposes an improved multiple goal function (MGF) method by appropriately using initial guess values (IGVs). After reading this manuscript, the following comments should be addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is evidently that good IGVs improve the accuracy. Therefore, the overloads for the IGVs should be analyzed to show the technical contribution. It is desired to provide further evaluation of the computational complexity.</li> <li>2. The authors are encouraged to exhibit examples that may be sensitive to initialization or having convergence problems. In contrast, the problem can be overcome by the proposed IGV to enhance the advantage of the paper.</li> <li>3. Because the proposed method is modified to [7], the performance comparison with [7] should be provided.</li> <li>4. line 111, equation (3.5): <math>f(x) = \beta I(x) - \lambda x + f(a)</math> should correct as <math>f(x) = \beta I(x) - \lambda x + f(a) + \lambda a</math>.</li> <li>5. line 115: <math>C = f(a) + \lambda(a)</math> should revise as <math>C = f(a) + \lambda a</math>.</li> <li>6. Because this manuscript is a "review article", the performance comparison and theoretical advantages should be thoroughly investigated.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The overloads for the IGVs were analysed and discussed in reference [9], I feared to discuss results that were already documented that's why I opted to leave that out. I did not understand evaluation of complexity. On what?</li> <li>2. For the examples provided initialization and convergence are a major concern when methods like Levenberg-Marquardt and Maximum likelihood are employed</li> <li>3. Tables provided under section 4 clear point out the parameter estimates from the different methods, hence compared.</li> <li>4. All these corrections have been effected in the manuscript. See pages 4 &amp; 5</li> <li>5. It's important to note that this was intended to be a "research article" not a "review Article". However appropriate practical comparisons have been considered see page 7 &amp; 8. For the theoretical advantage of the method see problem formulation page 3.</li> </ol>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. This manuscript should be carefully checked for the “space” required between words. There are too many words need to be separated for understanding. For example, lines 18, 39, 54, 57, 59, 68, 78, 79, 93, 95, 96, 106, 116, 118, 125, 126, 130, 134, 143, 163, 164.</li><li>2. The word “etc” in lines 33 and 76 should be consistent.</li><li>3. By appropriately revising the title of Section 2, the subsection 2.1 can be removed.</li><li>4. Only subsection 3.1 exists in Section 3, therefore, this subsection can be removed.</li><li>5. The title format of references should carefully check to meet the journal’s requirements.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The spaces are fine in the original manuscript; this error could have come up due to the numbering of the lines.</li><li>2. Corrected, see pages 2 &amp; 3.</li><li>3. Corrected as suggested.</li><li>4. Corrected as advised.</li><li>5. Journal requirements have been considered.</li></ol>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		