



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

keyword matching in the dataset...” “the domain of discus g is measure as;” should be “the domain of discus g is measured as:” “should not be greater than 3 otherwise” why the authors consider this limit? The authors should clearly justify, in the paper, why they chose the number 3 and simply randomly pick it seems not to be a wise answer. Most of the times, we made comparison tests with different values testing stopping marks (as other aspects) and then we can, based on facts, conclude and choose the proper values to use. The concept “Part-Of-Speech tag (POS)” needs bibliographic reference. In sentence “The percentage of occurrence k of a particular word $w_i \in M$ in sentence s_i is represented as:” should remove the indexes... “research propose system” should be “research proposed system” “student response to question” should be “student’s response to question “ “Response Trimmer depend on “ should be “Response Trimmer depends on ...” The concept Multivariate Bernoulli model needs bibliography references. As said in the previous review, throughout the subsection “marker class”, the authors present several scores. They must properly explain how the scores were chosen. If the authors use the values based on some bibliography or model, it should be properly referenced and stated. The authors should also review the full text, there are some words there are joined together... 4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION Section 4 is untitled as “Result and Discussion”, so it is supposed that in its contents the authors would present a discussion about the results obtained over the case study, with the 10 students. However, there are no discussion presented about the results (case study). The authors have two options: or present a complete discussion about the results/values showed in Table 1, and Figures 1 and 2; or just remove the word	Noted Noted This is because when 3 nouns or adjectives words exist side-by-side in a sentence without a comma punctuation (“,”) in-between them, the sentence is bound to lose its semantic nature. Hence the writer has attempted to out-smart the system. Noted. All noted Noted We arrived at the scores (percentage) using brute-force method during the system marking experiment. And it is found to produce better accuracy If the deep detailed discussion are to be made, the paper will be too length and get boring,
--	--



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

“discussion” from the title of the section (and from the reference/cite in other points of the paper). Another aspect, is about the questions used in the case study, why the authors do not show some examples? As the authors do in section 5, they could present the steps (calculations) made by the system for just one question/answer and then the tables and figures present the rest of the values... It would, with no doubts, improve the quality of the paper. If the authors consider that it is not proper at this moment to present an example, showing all the steps/calculation, because of the time consuming, I have no objection against it.

5. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Sections 4 and 5 are intended to be the parts of the paper where the authors present the case study of their approach. So, as a reader, it is expected that at least one example of all calculation were presented; it is expected to see the system do its job, step by step, that it really works.... For instance, in the Figure 3, the exact values of the mean divergence are not clear and are used to calculate the mean divergence. The authors just need to include in the chart the exact values and to present how one of the values are obtained (as they show the calculation of the mean divergence). In the previous review this already was referred: the need of the discussion and the clarification of how the values were obtained, on each step, (not in general) but for the case study...

therefore the discussion header will be remove. Nevertheless we belief that the sample tables and figures are quite explicit enough for any reader to capture knowledge.

Noted. We will include table indicating how the values for mean divergence were derived for further simplicity.