

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_119877
Title of the Manuscript:	Clustering Based Recommender System for Compilation of Research Papers
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The concept is highly innovative, providing essential information before commencing new research work. This approach ensures that researchers are well-informed and better prepared, ultimately enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of their inroads. By offering preliminary insights, this concept lays a solid foundation for new research endeavors and contributes significantly to the advancement of the field. 2. Its ok. 3. Yes with some exceptions. 4. The paper is well written. However, it would be more effective if it included a comparison of two to three existing recommender systems. Presenting and analyzing these systems in a table format, and identifying their limitations, would help highlight how this system addresses those issues. 5. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Significant improvements are needed, particularly in the formulation of the problem in terms of variables and matrices. The document does not clearly define variables such as (s, r, h/hash table, etc.). b) It would be more effective to present the solution in the form of pseudocode, followed by a detailed description, rather than listing the steps. c) The figures are not adequately explained, leaving readers uncertain about what is being presented. d) Terms like PROCLUS, FINDIT, CLIQUE, and MAFIA are mentioned but not referenced or defined. e) In Table 1, there are no columns labeled A, B, C, & D, and how calculation for 'Precision' and 'Recall' are calculated? f) Table 1 and Figure 3 present the same information, leading to unnecessary duplication that should be eliminated. g) The roles of NR, NP, and NCR in Table 1 and their impact on calculations are not clarified. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	Presenting the subspace-clustering method with only two simple formulas is insufficient. The results and discussion section needs to be rewritten to include a comparison between existing solutions and the proposed solution.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Imran Mujaddid Rabbani
Department, University & Country	UET, Punjab Judicial Academy, Pakistan