



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_15341
Title of the Manuscript:	Data Clustering using Hybridization Strategies of Continuous Ant Colony Optimization, Particle Swarm Optimization and genetic Algorithm
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are several issues which should be addressed by the authors: (1) In the experiment part, the authors select four dataset with small sizes and low dimensions. They should include four new datasets whose size is large, and include more experiments. (2) In this paper, the authors listed and analyzed many related algorithms. The author should at least select two or more popular and latest methods as the comparison algorithms to further demonstrate the advantages of the proposed algorithm. Otherwise, the experimental results are not convincing. (3) Some experiment results are listed in table 3 and table 4, but the authors should give more detailed interpretations about these performance difference.	1) Edited article include four new datasets whose size is large, and include more experiments. 2) In edited article, Sequential Approach with the enlarged pheromone-particle table and proposed model in eight dataset is Compared. 3) In item 6, “ Experiments ” the reasons for the superior the proposed model is discussed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		