



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The conclusions can be a little more precise and appealing. Rather than concluding every individual section or sub-section, the conclusions can be written for the entire paper and the methodologies used. 2. The references used in the paper are actually very old and out-dated. Recent references from 2013-2016 must be added. 3. Please avoid the usage of We in the paper. Eg. Instead of saying "We have proposed" rephrase it as "It is proposed that"	1. Section conclusions were removed in favor of a better flowing narrative. 2. Additional references were added from 2013-2016. 3. "We" was removed and replaced as appropriate.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The abstract comprises of several sub headings which definitely need to be omitted. It's definitely a clear distinction to differentiate the summarized content but it would be better if the contents are just merged in the abstract without any subheadings. 2. The Place and Duration of Study need not be mentioned in the abstract; rather it can come in the Introduction. 3. The implementation part in Section 4.2, Image Retrieval can be elaborated with details like nature of the database used and the source of the data sets can be included. 4. The Results obtained can be compared with previous methods quantitatively or graphically	1. The subheadings were removed from the abstract, however, the headings were only included based on the template. Another reviewer had conflicting suggestions on the Abstract. Direction on preference is requested from the editors. 2. The heading was removed from the abstract. 3. Additional information is provided along with a reference for the full original study and database development. 4. This is one of the goals of a future article. The current article is a short article directed towards



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to ensure the proposed methodology is better than the existing ones(This is entirely optional and not mandatory, left to the authors to decide)	development and initial testing.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Write the Motivation & contribution of the paper separately in Introduction section before the organization. 2. The concept of introducing Q-measure is quite appropriate and innovative. 3. The depiction of calculating the rotational difference between two different data sets is quite clear and impressive. 4. The various properties of Q-metric are discussed well furnishing all the necessary details. 5. The core strength of the paper is the detailed discussion of Transformation Properties which makes the paper interesting. 6. The technicality attributed in the paper is good. 7. The Overall presentation is quite pleasing and appreciable. 8. The paper Quality is good but definitely the quality can be increased by discussing the implementation in depth, as in the software's used, etc.	