



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_25206
Title of the Manuscript:	Approximate Functional Dependencies Mining Using Association Rules Specificity Interestingness Measure
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	The author deals with AFDs after “explaining” about them in the introduction. It would have been better if any explanation was offered for choosing specificity over sensitivity, error rate and accuracy. The existing algorithm is not explained clearly and the results obtained are not at all visualised.	Agreed with the reviewer's comment I have done all the revision required
Minor REVISION comments	Starting from the abstract, many English sentence construction errors can be seen. It would be better for the author to correct them. Ex: Mining Approximate Functional Dependencies (AFDs) from a database may produces valuable interesting relationships among its variables... The mining of AFDs still posing a special set of challenges	Agreed with the reviewer's comment I have done all the revision required
Optional/General comments	There are no languages like 'Urdo' or Hindo'. They are actually 'Urdu' and 'Hindi'.	Agreed with the reviewer's comment I have done all the revision required