GLOBAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH
(Scholarly Peer Review Publishing System)

CEO: Different Reviews on PhD in Artificial Intelligence

Satish Gajawada
INDIA

ABSTRACT

Thanks to everyone who helped me to reach the stage where I am now. Recently, a new optimization method, 'PhD: The Human Optimization' has been proposed in the Artificial Intelligence field. This paper gives different reviews of different experts on 'PhD' in Artificial Intelligence. The nick name of this work is 'CEO'.

Keywords: Different; Reviews; PhD; Artificial Intelligence; The Human Optimization.

1.   Introduction

There are various papers in literature in which new algorithms were proposed. For example in [1] Vinayaka was proposed. But there are no papers which give several reviews of different experts for the same algorithm proposed. This paper is an attempt in this direction.

2.   Different Reviews

This section gives various reviews of several experts for the recently proposed 'PhD' method in [2].

The abstract of PhD method proposed in [2] is "This paper is dedicated to everyone who is interested in the Artificial Intelligence. In the past, researchers have explored behavior of chromosomes, birds, fishes, ants, bacteria, bees and so on to create excellent optimization methods for solving complex optimization problems. The author proposed the Human Optimization in this paper. Humans progressed like anything. They help each other. There are so many plus points in Humans. In fact all optimization algorithms based on other beings are created by Humans. There is so much to explore in behavior of Human for creating awesome optimization algorithms. Artificial Fishes, birds, ants, bees etc have solved optimization problems. Similarly, optimization method based on Humans is expected to solve complex problems. This paper sets the trend for all optimization algorithms that come in future based on Humans."

A   Review 1

This paper studies a so-called human optimization method which falls into the research topic of optimization. The proposed method was presented on the first page followed by some discussions. The paper clearly makes no

novel contribution to the state of the art on optimization algorithms and techniques. Thus, because of this lack of new contribution, the paper is not appropriate for the conference.

B   Review 2

Based on the review of your abstract, the following editorial comments should be taken into consideration: Please submit an abstract. Change font type. Remove PhD from the title. Please follow the abstract guidelines.

C   Review 3

Nothing to evaluate.

D   Review 4

Funny paper, especially the notion of "love array" :)

E   Review 5

This is not a research paper. It should not have been submitted for review. Rationale and results are completely lacking. I do not even think there is a research idea in there.

F   Review 6

General conclusion is 'Accept without reservation'.
Further comments of the evaluator are below:
The title should be changed to be more comprehensive. The clarity and relevance of the problem is well stated. How is the problem scientifically analyzed through the text? the main propositions of the paper are crystal clear. The conclusion part should also contain more details expressing if other researches in the field support the results. The text needs to be re-considered by a native English speaker to edit the errors. It is recommended that the author adds more sources since the year 2012. the research method should be explained in more details.

G   Review 7

General conclusion is 'Accept without reservation'.
Further comments of the evaluator are below:
The title is well in accord with the body of the text. The clarity and relevance of the problem is well stated. How is the problem scientifically analyzed through the text? Reasoning of main propositions are satisfying. In conclusion part, It is needed to support the result of the research by other recent researches. The English language needs little modification in abstract part. The references are good but it is recommended that the author uses more references from the recent years. The author needs to make the main goals crystal clear.

H   Review 8

Paper has been ACCEPTED.

Specific behavior of the human has to be specified for the model.
Few Examples/scenarios where this could be applied has to be explained.
The time complexity of the optimization algorithm has to be demonstrated over the brute force method.
Initialization of Guidance location and generalized form of updating the guidance location/love array should be explained in detail with appropriate formula.
Paper is very abstract about the idea discussed.

GLOBAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH
(Scholarly Peer Review Publishing System)

I   Review 9

Main advantages of the work:
1. Rather conceptual work pondering another interesting approach to optimization problem solution. Goals are clearly stated and the new algorithm is provided and explained.

Main disadvantages of the work:
1. Qualitative comparison to other optimization algorithms is not provided. Why proposed algorithm could be thought as specifically modeling human optimization is not fully explicated.
2. It is not clearly stated whether Guidance Locations and Love array are local or global, i.e. are they vectors or matrices? Seems like the latter.

Decision: this paper should be accepted for participation in the conference

J   Review 10

Main advantages of the work:
1. New method for the creation of innovative optimization algorithms is proposed in the work.
2. The function Update Locations of Humans in optimization algorithm explained in depth.
3. An overview of existing works on the same topic is provided.
4. Calculations of the fitness values of guidance locations of the Human are analyzed.

Main disadvantages of the work:
1. It is not demonstrated how PhD method have been applied for solving complex optimization problems.
2. It is not clear either there are some software implementation of Human Optimization that confirm practical feasibility of the method.

Decision: this paper should be accepted for participation in the conference

K Review 11

Review 11 a: A very interesting paper.

Review 11 b: I have to admit that I had a hard time grasping the key concepts revealed in this manuscript. The author has set a very ambitious goal. But I am still searching for the elements that will make this goal a reality. The proposed algorithm is simply too abstract to be of substantial value.

GLOBAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH
(Scholarly Peer Review Publishing System)

Table 1. Different Review results of PhD.

Review	Accepted/Rejected
Review 1	Rejected
Review 2	Accepted
Review 3	Rejected
Review 4	Rejected
Review 5	Rejected
Review 6	Accepted
Review 7	Accepted
Review 8	Accepted
Review 9	Accepted
Review 10	Accepted
Review 11	Accepted

Table 1. above shows the status (accepted/rejected) of PhD in different reviews from several experts.

3.   Conclusion

It has been observed from some reviews that PhD method is rejected whereas from other reviews PhD method is accepted. It can be observed from few reviews that PhD method is funny and there is no research and nothing to evaluate while from other reviews it can be observed that PhD method is innovative and interesting. Thanks to all researchers who are giving efforts in the Artificial Intelligence field.

4.   REFERENCES

[1].   Satish Gajawada and Durga Toshniwal, *Vinayaka : A Semi-Supervised Projected Clustering Method Using Differential Evolution*. International Journal of Software Engineering & Applications (IJSEA), Vol.3, No.4, July 2012.

[2].   Satish Gajawada, *PhD: The Human Optimization*. Third International Scientific Conference of Students, and Young Scientists **"**Theoretical and applied aspects of cybernetics**",** November 2013.