



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_26476
Title of the Manuscript:	A Metric for Data Set Comparison Via QR-Factorization
Type of the Article	Method 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. The article introduces a new method for comparing matrix data sets based on QR-factorizations. The method measures the degree of similarity between two matrices in the range of [0, 1]. However, the effectiveness/performance of this new method was not evaluated against existing methods which will justify the introduction of the new method as well as ensure the effectiveness and the success of this new method. 2. Abstract section: • Study design: The study design in the abstract section should be well written. The author(s) should also specify the type of design that was used for the study. • Place and Duration of Study: The author(s) should give the full meaning of A&T • Methodology: The method used to achieve the objective of the study is missing here. • Result: The authors should clearly explain the result by providing numerical values to buttress their point • Conclusion: The authors should	1. This is true and will be the focus of future work. One of the other reviewers found the testing against other methods to be optional and left to the authors. The work is intended to eventually be applied to 3D data sets. At that point, we believe that it would be most appropriate to compare to existing methods. 2. The abstract section was rewritten based on the suggestions of a previous reviewer and this reviewer. We have submitted the version that corresponds to the previous reviewer, but request direction from the editors relative to preference.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	conclude the abstract by including the effectiveness of this new method compared to existing methods 3. Introduction The organization of the paper should be introduced in sections. For instance, section 2 deals with QR factorization and QR metrics, section 3 discusses..... 4. Properties of the Q-metric should be changed to Properties of Q-metric 5. In section 3 (properties of the Q-metric), the authors should enumerate the metric properties first before describing them in the section 6. The authors should check Table 1 and fill the rows completely and appropriately 7. The table should also be neatly presented in two columns, that is, column 1 for sample and column 2 for Q-metric, rather than breaking the values 8. In addition, the authors should briefly explain how the figures on the tables were obtained 9. Figure 4 is blurred. The authors should make it clear. The numbers on the axes of the figure should also be made clear 10. All mathematical equations in the article should be explicitly explained 11. The mathematical symbols in the equations should also be clearly defined 12. The authors should explicitly specify the source of their dataset. For instance, Homberger et al., (2008) used digitized parrots stored in a	3. The paragraph was rewritten to reflect the suggestions. 4. The word "the" was removed. 5. The metric properties to be shown were added and enumerated. 6. The table was correctly filled in with the data that was used, but made horizontal for space considerations. The table has been transposed and is now vertical with no empty spaces. 7. There are no breaks in the table now. 8. A brief explanation that the values in the table were calculated using equation 2.1 is included. 9. The figures were expanded and broken up into two figures to help make the numbers visible. 10. A brief statement was added for the first occurrence of each equation. 11. Additional statements were added for non-ubiquitous symbols 12. A statement was added relative to the origin of the data set as well as a citation for the
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	database as their dataset 13. The authors should explicitly explain each of the figures and their implications 14. Conclusion: • Conclusions should be changed to conclusion • The ??? in the conclusion should be replaced with the appropriate text • The conclusion should not be sectionized. It must also be improved and the authors should introduce information about future work 15. In all, the article needs to be written more formally and the grammar should also be carefully reviewed.	original article with additional information on the process by which the dataset was created. 13. Additional statements were added to the figure labels and, in some locations, the narrative. 14. 1)The section heading was made singular. 2) This was a LaTeX compilation error. It has been addressed. 3) This was again a product of the template. It has been removed and has more of a narrative structure. 15. Noted, and adjustments have been made, however, without specifics we can not say that we have met the reviewer's intended changes.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The authors should present the references in the order in which they appear in the paper 2. The authors need to follow the journal guidelines	1. This is in direct conflict with the template which states: " [References should be listed alphabetically at the end of the manuscript. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa.]" We updated based on the reviewer suggestions but request the editor's preference. 2. Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		