

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_120452
Title of the Manuscript:	On some aspects of Multi-Dimensional Scaling: Insights and Applications
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript does not reflect that of a research article. It is more like a descriptive text book chapter on "Multi-Dimensional Scaling". No original research aspect conducted by the author(s) could be noted in the article. Other than using some example data to demonstrate the applications of MDS, Scree plots, etc, there is a huge lack of originality representation in the whole manuscript to be accepted in the present form as a research article.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title needs to have some minor alterations if the author(s) should highlight on "what is the objective of the study they have conducted", and should be more specific. The present tile is general for a research article/manuscript.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The Abstract is comprehensive upto some extent. The objective of the study may be highlighted in between the paragraph.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1.0 Introduction section generally is in 1 whole set, the author may elaborate the need to sub-divide into 1.1 Multidimensional Scaling (MDS) when there is no sub-section 1.2. Highlight of previous investigators (reference studies) is not appropriately reflected in the article. The "applications of MDS" has been described in bullet points, which are not generally practiced in research manuscripts and the contents seem more as a conventional text book content. The author(s) may condense this portion. 2. "Definitions and examples" section may be better substituted by the more important section as Materials and Methods. Results and Discussions section is not explicitly represented about the R program scheme used or developed in the present study.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Most Figures to be re-constructed appropriately and NOT pasted as a screen shot; Figure nos to be titled as "1" not in roman notation (i) as generally followed in sciebtific manuscripts; x and y axis title fonts in graph plots are not legible in most figures, the same is to set to Times New Roman 10 to 12 sizes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	(No comments though ideally REFRENCES are less as compared to other manuscripts of similar work)	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language vocabulary is suitable for general scholarly communications but may not be too suitable for research oriented communications.	
Optional/General comments	Most of the Figures are mostly screen shots of excel files. The figures presented in the manuscript may be reproduced as tables with sequential numbering as per journal format. General description may be substituted by the author(s) original work. More elaboration in Conclusion section will make the article more meaningful.	

Review Form 3

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:	Ngangbam Romeji
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Technology, India