



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 algorithm proposed in 2005 by D. Karaboga can be specified in the introduction and not in abstract. - There is a conflict in the year of original proposal of ABC algorithm mentioned in abstract and introduction(2005 or 2007?) - Typographical mistakes need to be corrected (eg., in the introduction part: combinatorial optimization problems in a wide variety o fields) - From the numerical performance perspective, the ABC algorithm (Comma missing) - Grammatical mistakes need to be corrected (eg., 1. Section 5 presents the modifications introduced in the and 2. Section 6 presents the set of test optimization problems used in the testing experiments and the obtained results when the novel) - Literature survey is missing and must be given - the effectiveness of the proposed method has not been fully clarified	- OK, I agree - Checked and corrected! - OK - OK - OK - It is not a survey article, the purpose is to introduce a new ABC variant (1P-ABC), but notice that two very good comprehensive survey articles about the ABC method and its applications are recommended in the Introduction section, I don't think that I need to repeat in my article information from them. Also notice that the other 3 ABC variants used in comparisons are described in details, or references with detailed descriptions are given. - It is difficult to prove the effectiveness of a method in the first presentation article. The effectiveness of the proposed method was proved when compared with the other 3 selected ABC variants only on the testbed of selected diverse multimodal optimization functions, as it is a standard methodology for meta-heuristic methods. The method at the current phase was not designed for winning competitions and the purpose of the article is not to claim that it is the best method (there are no best methods, according to the "No Free Lunch Theorem", as it is also mentioned in the article). The purpose was only to introduce some original ideas that proved effective when compared with other un-sophisticated ABC variants. Many improvements are needed in order to make it a competitive method, but it is the purpose of further developments. Thank you for rising this issue, it should be better explained in the conclusions and further research section.
-	- The general Working principle and application/uses of CGOP can be specified - References to previous work need not be specified in conclusion part	- CGOP is a general model for representing the optimization problems. Before solving any optimization problem, it should be represented according to the CGOP model. The presentations of the test functions in the experimental section of the article are respecting to the CGOP model. Even more general than the CGOP model is the MINLP model, but it is not treated in the article. Thank you for rising this issue and helping me in improving the presentation. - OK, I agree
Optional/General comments	- The paper needs proof reading. The language is ok but there are grammatical errors - Comparison measure can still be added - Novelty is ok	- OK, I agree - The chosen measure is the best according to my experience, it clearly quantifies both criteria (NFE and success rate) and it is easy to apply and interpret. It is the methodology I promote in my work! Appropriate measures will be used in the future when comparing this algorithm, or improved variants of it, with previously published work, on other test functions. I already have a conference paper approved for publication ("An adaptive penalty function method for constrained continuous optimization in population-based meta-heuristic optimization methods"), in which I compared the 1P-ABC method with previously published work based on another measure (obviously, the one used by the previous work) and on different test functions (the G set of constrained optimization problems), and the results were excellent. - Thanks!