



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_33615
Title of the Manuscript:	Text Summarization versus CHI for Feature Selection in Arabic Text Classification
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	1. The abstract is not well written. The author did not give clear description about the work. The line "In this research, We consider Arabic documents..... and propose text summarization for feature selection". The algorithm for text summarization for feature selection is not given anywhere in the paper. 2. From the abstract, the author specified explicitly the SVM classifier is used for text categorization. Then what is the need to write as "both Classification" in the following sentences in the paper. 3. The role to feature selection in promoting the classification accuracy is not described anywhere in the paper. 4. The line No. 17 and 18 are unmeaningful. My suggestion about this, The author could rewrite the sentences as "Many classification algorithms such as KNN, NB, SVM.....[6] were applied to different datasets. 5. The references cited [2][4][5][6][8] & others in the line no. 22 and 23 are not appropriate and the formatted way is improper especially the reference	The abstract is rewritten Noted Lines 20 to 23 Noted Lines 77 to 82 Lines 77 to 82



SDI Review Form 1.6

	number 4. 6. The statistics proof for producing the summary of the document through an automatic text summarization algorithm is not clearly described. 7. By the feature selection what are the features (or) types of features are eliminated in order to reduce the document size and in what way the whole document is summarized by automatic text summarization method. 8. The Comparative results of SVM with the other few traditional classifiers such as NB, KNN and so on are not shown in this research work in order to understand how far the SVM is superior to other methods in terms of performance measures like Accuracy, Precision, Recall and Execution time. 9. Under related work the author discussed generally about the efficacy of either Feature Selection method (or) Classification Method. But the author not yet specified in what way proposed method in this research overcomes the other method. 10. In what way the relevant sentences with in a text are summarized in the summary of documents. What statistical measure is applied to select the relevant text? 11. On What basis the author says CHI is best feature	This kind of comparison was conducted in the references mentioned. Noted and added at end of the related work section .Further, this research conduct a comparison between using two different feature selection techniques (CHI square and text summarization) in terms of their effect on text classification precision, recall, accuracy , and execution time. Mentioned before We did not say it is the best, but according to the references mentioned in the paper, it overcomes others in some comparisons. Arabic language needs special treatment when used in WEKA, yes it is the normal version of WEKA but Arabic text is not entered directly as input, but it passes a pre-processing step before.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	selection technique for text summarization? 12. Under Experimental Results, the statistical formula for the accuracy is not provided and also need some description regarding analysis of the result obtained by WEKA Tool based on the Arabic Text Documents. 13. Still I am in distrust of how the normal version of WEKA Tool accepts and study the Arabic documents under JAVA platform. Is any special translator is applied for the language conversion? Any have as a part of review process and role of reviewer I am very eager to see the WEKA software applied for this research.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In line No.42, CHI is wrongly written as GHI.	Noted and done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper was generally well designed. The language of the paper was fluent. The authors need to proofread the manuscript.	Noted and done