



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_38065
Title of the Manuscript:	1P-ABC, a simplified ABC variant for continuous optimization problems
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	The proposed paper is a comparison of different types of artificial bee colonies algorithm. I do not understand why these 11 known scalable multimodal optimization functions are used to evaluate the system. It is better to try the proposed method on any mathematical system model. Because these 11 known scalable multimodal optimization functions show different responses in diverse applications. My decision is: Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered) Because, there are seems to be a lot of similarity to the article. Plagiarism issue I think plagiarism is suspected, Because for example; the titles of "Continuous Global Optimization Problem (CGOP)" and "Deb's Rules for Constraints Handling" is identical with https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/awutm.2016.54.issue-2/awutm-2016-0012/awutm-2016-0012.xml These are the same in the different articles. Additionally, given algorithmic snippets on pages 103 and 106 are same with "http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7426118/?reload=true" The article should be checked with a program like "iThenticate".	- It is physically impossible to try a new optimization method on any mathematical system model (they are infinite in number). Therefore, as a consecrated practice, always a testbed of diverse test functions is selected for comparison purposes. Depending on the quality of the selected testbed, the results can be extrapolated to the general set of optimization problems, but due to the difficulty of the general global optimization problem (an NP-complete problem), there is still no guarantee that the proposed method can solve any mathematical model. I tested the method on many other optimization problems with good results and some further results will be published in the near future (I already have a conference paper approved for publication). I appreciate that you raised this issue because it is signalling to me that some improvement is needed in the presentation related to the selection of the testbed. - Similar combinations of words can appear when you describe known concepts, but it is important to give appropriate references, so that it becomes clear from the context that you don't claim priority on those concepts. In my opinion, a more serious plagiarism (than simple combinations of words) appears when you claim priority of concepts and ideas you steal from other people, and I don't think it is the case here in my article. The article is not claiming priority in introducing the concepts of "Continuous Global Optimization Problem (CGOP)" and "Deb's Rules for Constraints Handling" (even the title is hinting that they are recognized as pertaining to Deb), these are consecrated concepts in the optimization field and relevant references to them are given. They are used only to introduce other concepts and notations in order to build the presentation of the real original contribution, the 1P-ABC algorithm and the results of its testing. Also, please notice that the algorithmic snippet at page 103 is identical to the one in the mentioned paper, simply because it is describing the same optimization method, the classic ABC method of Karaboga (the work of Karaboga is recognized by giving relevant references), but the algorithmic snippet at page 106 is not the same, please notice that Step 4: Onlooker Bees Phase; was eliminated, and it is really claimed as an original modification to the ABC method. Anyway, in order to eliminate any further controversy, I will reference the papers you mentioned where appropriate. If you want to help in checking my article against plagiarism, then I suggest to you to search for published ABC variants with only one population of bees and check if they are similar to my proposal.
Minor REVISION comments	Where is the application? The authors should explain in paper, which programs were used here or how the values in these tables are calculated. This work should be articulated in how, under what circumstances, under what constraints.	- I used software programs developed by myself by applying the described concepts and algorithms. All my work is described in details so that the results can be reproduced by implementations using any programming language suitable for scientific computing applications. There are no special circumstances, nor constraints. I appreciate that you raised this issue because it is signalling to me that some improvement in the presentation is needed related to the implementation of the algorithms (although in most cases it is self-explanatory).
Optional/General comments		Please reconsider your decision after the proposed changes are implemented.