Title of article: Automatic building of an ontology from a corpus of text documents using data mining tools.

Number: 279

1.	Type of Article	Review [ ]	Research [X]		Please Tick
2.	Does the article title reflect the subject matter?				Yes [X] No [ ]
3.	Does the paper fit within the scope of the journal and is it of interest to its readers?				Yes [X] No [ ]
4.	Does this paper contain substantially new and interesting results that are of sufficient importance to justify publication?				Yes [X] No [ ]
5.	Does the abstract of article satisfactorily show the aims, methods and result of the article?				Yes [X] No [ ]
6.	Does the article have a practical base?				Yes [X] No [ ]
7.	Does the article have a theoretical base?				Yes [X] No [ ]
8.	Are the materials and methods described in the article adequate to support the arguments?				Yes [X] No [ ]
9.	Do the obtained results weigh against the article's materials?				Yes [X] No [ ]
10.	Does the language used adequately inform the reader?				Yes [X] No [ ]
11.	Does the article have sufficient length to adequately satisfy its aims?				Yes [X] No [ ]
12.	Are figures and tables used in the article sufficiently annotated or captioned?				Yes [X] No [ ]
13.	Are the references shown relevant?				Yes [X] No [ ]
14.	Are the conclusions logical and justified?				Yes [X] No [ ]

Please tick where applicable to rate this paper based on the scale

Unacceptable	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
0-20[ ]	30-40 [ ]	50-60 [ ]	70-80 [ ]	90-100 [X]

Please tick where applicable to evaluate this paper

Acceptable [ ]   Acceptable with minor revision [X]   Acceptable with major revision [ ]   Rejected   [ ]

NOTE: The most important parts of your review are the written comments that will be transmitted to the author. On the following page, please give a straightforward assessment of the importance of the ideas and/or results presented in this paper. Your written comments should provide a thorough technical appraisal of the reported work. If the manuscript contains information that will be of interest to international readership, please indicate those parts of the manuscript that should be corrected before publication. Reviewers are also encouraged to suggest ways to improve the paper, even if it is acceptable in its original form.
COMMENTS:

Very good paper. Small typographic errors in pages 9, 10, 11 signaled in the reviewed version of the paper must be corrected.

Sent on 30.04.11 | **Return by 24.10.11**