



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Distance always involves a difference rather than a sum. The distance function (2.1.1) should be $\sqrt{[x^{(1)} - y^{(1)}]^2 + [x^{(2)} - y^{(2)}]^2}$. A similar argument applies to the distance function (2.1.2). Within the modulus signs there should be minuses rather than pluses. Line 168: How can the joint distribution of $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ be equal to the marginal distribution of x_n? Lines 183 and 184: $P(x/z, \alpha)$ as given in equation (2.6.1) is univariate in x rather than bivariate. What is the conclusion of this work in more practical terms?	No, the modulus signs can't be minuses rather than plus as seen in the comment. The correct formular for Euclidean distance and Mahattman distance was stated in the manuscript for (2.1.1) and (2.1.2) respectively. Mahattman distance is the distance between two points measured along axes at right angles. In a plane with p1 at (x1, y1) and p2 at (x2, y2), it is $x^1 - x^2 + y^1 - y^2$. It is the simple sum of the horizontal and vertical components. I can't find anything of such in the line 168 as stated. In line 183, It is a case of a joint probability distribution for two unknown variables (i.e. Bivariate distribution). Because it contain x which is crime location and Z which denotes the anchor point). Hence the equation is not a univariate one. The conclusion has been modified according to the final evaluator's comment. The reviewed manuscripts presents the conclusion in clear and more practical terms.