



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_45837
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating some internal validity indices for clustering methods
Type of the 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>)

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		Agree
Minor REVISION comments	Line 42: Such as Lines 69-70: please rewrite the sentence. Make it clear (For example Gaussian distribution...) Line 75: There is no clear separation for the reader to distinguish between ci and Ci in the formula. Please use different character or make sure they are distinguishable. Line 94: There is no Ck in the formula. Make sure the reference is valid. Line 104: please define Si Line 116: is not a clear sentence. Please rephrase. Line 119-120: please provide a clear sentence. It has been a result of independent study ? How is that relevant. Line 165: what "Number of " represents. Please state in the table or in the text. If it is dimensions, features ... please state. In tables 2-9 please indicate in the first row which is the expected K (number of clusters) , so the reader can evaluate the results better. Line 180-181: Also please state how you determined the best results. Did you plot it and observed ? The reader does not know. Limitation section. Please provide limitations that might resulted in poor detection	Agree and corrected Line 165: what "Number of " represents. Please state in the table or in the text. If it is dimensions, features ... please state. IT WAS HIDDEN In tables 2-9 please indicate in the first row which is the expected K (number of clusters) , so the reader can evaluate the results better. Already exists in the text but I will update it
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	agree