



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_27558
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF AN AUTOMATED DESCRIPTIVE TEXT-BASED SCORING SYSTEM
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 <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	The manuscript describes automating system to score text work of students, eg essays. The problem and presented ideas are very interesting. The main drawback is the not representative results. The accuracy was measured on 10 student's works, what is definitely not enough. The algorithms should have, that are not representative. Moreover, the rules extracted from training data should have been used on other cases, should generalize. Because the algorithm has many parameters, e.g. dictionaries, the number of tested examples should be bigger, in my opinion several hundred student's works. The other remark is the request to add more details of created and/or used software. The programming languages and/or environments could be described. The used data could be available on web page connected with paper.	The algorithm for the research model will be included in the paper, more so the system architecture; in order for show connection between each component of the used model. However, the rule extracted from the training was used throughout and nothing else, and was clearly stated. The numbers of tested data may be considered small, but we want you to know that this data include live master students' examination answer script which were considered confidential to the school authority (department of computer science federal university of technology akure, Nigeria). 10 of these script were release to us though we are still pushing for 100 scripts. More so, there were several other student's work used to test result but we considered them as not live data so, were not accounted as part of the tested work. The software used was developed by the research team base on our proposed model. The programming language and environment used will be included in the paper. The data used are confidential to the institution, we need to be granted rights in order to make it available online, so, we cannot grantee it availability now.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1.problem with capital letters in abstract; 2. literature reviews, please reformat text to make it more clear; 3. page 3 last line, dot is expected after 'learning algorithm'; 4. please include the link to sources of presented software and to testing data; other researchers should have oportunity to test described method.	<i>Comment 1&2&3</i> will be amended in the paper but <i>comment 4</i> may be pending the time the team is given rights to make data publicly available.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	the work should be published if the testing set will be greatly extended and the accuracy of scoring by presented approach will be acceptable	