



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_39635
Title of the Manuscript:	Improved FTWeightedHashT Apriori Algorithm on Big Data using Hadoop-MapReduce Model
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
From line 151, "itemset" or "item" is used without distinguishing them, which makes it impossible to understand the proposed methodology. This is a very serious problem, and it is not easy to solve if the authors do not understand the difference between both concepts.	The item is a unique item in a particular transaction while the itemset is set of items in a particular transaction (it could be 2 items or 3 items ...etc depends on the length of transaction) So the difference between them is clear. It is very significant comment. I agree there is a confusing in text between item and itemset. The Filtering process is done to items level as I told you before. The itemset term mentioned in text could be an item or itemset depends on the iteration. So the confusing is clarified. Thank you very much for this comment. I appreciate it.
The indentation used in figure 4 is dirty, makes understanding the code difficult. Use variables like "m" of which I do not know the meaning.	The meaning of variables used in pseudo code are added.
They talk about "Big Data" but work with two files of 4Mb and 558Kb, divided into blocks of 64Mb... ARM does not have runtime problems in such small collections, so the conclusions should be limited to the tests performed. In addition, new research such as [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417417307091] shows that datasets like mushroom contain more association rules than are really useful.	We used such small datasets because the former work [4] that we improved has used them. We must use the same datasets to compare our results with theirs. Advice has been taken.
The line of the investigation seems correct, the authors seek to use new concepts and technologies to solve old but current problems. In the abstract they indicate that they have reviewed more than 100 papers, in the content they show that the review of articles on ARM is improvable, after which their work could reach higher quality.	Our work has reached higher quality than the work of [4].