



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_22192
Title of the Manuscript:	BAYESIAN APPROACH TO PREDICT OFFENDER'S PROBABLE ANCHOR POINT USING GEOGRAPHIC PROFILING SYSTEM IN AKURE, NIGERIA
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	1- Authors should justify the selection of the distance decay and the buffer zone variables to expand existing geographic profiling systems. 2- Authors should define clearly the terms distance decay and buffer zone within the paper context. 3- In section 3, the contribution of integrating the decay and the buffer zone variables is not clear. Author should clarify their contribution through development of the system. 4- In section 4, authors should show the efficiency of integrating the decay and the buffer zone variables to the results. Or they may have a separate discussion section presents the efficiency of their contribution to the results.	1. The selection of the distance decay and the buffer zone variables to expand existing geographic profiling systems has been justified in the revised manuscript. 2. The terms distance decay and buffer zone has now been defined within the paper context in the revised manuscript. 3. The contribution of integrating the decay and the buffer zone variables has been clarified. 4. This relates to the (2). It is in the revised manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1- The related references are quite old. It is recommended to involve latest research and applications to develop more reliable system. 2- All formulas in the paper are missing 3- Correct the sentence "It was ensure that there is be no other information in the file".	1. Just few of them are old. Majority of the references are not old. 2. The equations are all in the revised manuscript. 3. The sentence has been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Discuss the limitation of the work.	