



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_34916
Title of the Manuscript:	Recurrent Neural Network Based Modeling of Gene Regulatory Network Using Bat Algorithm
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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Discuss obtained results in proper manner. 2. Values of FPR and TPR are not appearing correct, kindly check coding errors.	The authors would like to thank the reviewers and the editor for their valuable comments. We have tried to rectify each and every revision (both major and minor) to the best of our abilities. The modifications are shown by yellow color. 1. Discuss obtained results in proper manner. Response 4: In this paper, we have applied BA metaheuristic to infer the Gene regulatory Network based on RNN. Here, initially we used BA for 5 gene artificial network inference problem. BA was also tested against noisy data (for small scale genetic network). Next, parametric sensitivity (like accuracy with respect to population, iteration value etc.) of BA has been tested. Lastly, BA is applied against real life GRN of E. coli. All results are described (and comparison with state of art techniques) one by one. However, it would be very helpful to the authors if the reviewer mentioned or pointed out precisely the problems those found in results section. 2. Values of FPR and TPR are not appearing



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Response 5: The authors don't understand the meaning of FPR and TPR in this context. However, we have modified the Table 5 and 8 where all values of TP, FP, TN and FP are given for better comparisons. However, it would be very helpful to the authors if the reviewer mentioned or pointed out precisely the problems regarding FPR and TPR. 3. Kindly check coding errors Response 6: The code is rewritten and corrected. Please see the Page 14 (line 277-308) Response 7: Apart from the reviewers' comments, few typos are corrected throughout the manuscript.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		