



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_30376
Title of the Manuscript:	A Design of an Automatic Web Page Classification System
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	Author mentioned 3 different algorithm for the hybrid classifications. In my opinion, how these algorithms combined as hybrid classifier must be explained briefly in methodology. At least there should be a flowchart for hybrid algorithm thus readers can visualize the combination of these algorithms. There is a flowchart but it is for testing phase not for overall process of the algorithm. Author said tables contains execution time for the testing phase but I cannot see them. Also there should be comparison table for overall process which shows all experiments' result in one dimension thus we can observe results of all algorithm in one place. Plagiarism issue: According to iThenticate report there is 23% similarity score which is high in my opinion. I have attached the iThenticate report for this manuscript as a supplementary file. And author should be concerned about this problem.	
Minor REVISION comments	Conclusion seems a bit short. For example author should give suggestions for the future improvements or how other scientists can use these process. Also author should compare the result of himself with other studies which use similar methodology.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	According to iThenticate plagiarism report, the manuscript has a bit high score and authors and editor should concern this situation. The manuscript shows a different perspective of text classification which is important I believe. It would be better if the comments above are applied.	
---	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ufuk Çelik</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Computer Programming Department, Gonen Vocational School, Bandirma Onyedi Eylul University Turkey</i>