

International Journal of Research Publications

25 Reviews on Artificial Human Optimization Field for the First Time in Research Industry

Satish Gajawada

Alumnus, Indian Institute of Technology, Roorkee, Uttaranchal, 247667, India

Abstract

The author proposed a new field titled “Artificial Human Optimization” in December 2016 [1]. He authored the following five articles in Artificial Human Optimization field:

1) Entrepreneur: Artificial Human Optimization. Transactions on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence, Volume 4 No 6 December (2016); pp: 64-70 [1]. 2) “CEO: Different Reviews on PhD in Artificial Intelligence”, Global Journal of Advanced Research, vol. 1, no.2, pp. 155-158, 2014 [2]. 3) “POSTDOC : The Human Optimization”, Computer Science & Information Technology (CS & IT), CSCP, pp. 183-187, 2013 [3]. 4) “Artificial Human Optimization – An Introduction”, Transactions on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence, Volume 6, No 2, pp: 1-9, April 2018 [4]. 5) “An Ocean of Opportunities in Artificial Human Optimization Field”, Transactions on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence, Volume 6, No 3, June 2018 [5].

The complete reviews of all the above papers are shown in this paper for the first time in Research Industry. This paper is a new kind of research paper where the focus is completely on the reviews obtained for a particular new field. This work is the extension of work in [2]. Similar to this paper, the article [2] is completely focused on reviews obtained. The difference between article [2] and this paper lies in the fact that in this paper reviews are shown for all the papers of the author in Artificial Human Optimization field whereas article [2] shows reviews of single paper in Artificial Human optimization field.

Keywords: Artificial Human Optimization; New field; Reviews; Machine Learning; Artificial Intelligence; Nature Inspired Computing; Bip-Inspired Computing; Genetic Algorithms; Particle Swarm Optimization; Ant Colony Optimization.

1. Abstracts of Papers

This section shows abstracts of papers in “Artificial Human Optimization” field for which reviews are shown in section 2.

Abstract of article [1] is shown below as it is:

“A new field titled ‘Artificial Human Optimization’ is introduced in this paper. All optimization methods which were proposed based on Artificial Humans will come under this new field. Less than 20 papers were published in this field so far. The goal of this paper is to introduce ‘Artificial Human Optimization’ and to show abstracts of papers published in this new field. The nick name given to this work is ENTREPRENEUR.”

Abstract of article [2] is shown below as it is:

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

Abstract of article [3] is shown below as it is:

“This paper is dedicated to everyone who is interested in the Artificial Intelligence. John Henry Holland proposed Genetic Algorithm in the early 1970s. Ant Colony Optimization was proposed by Marco Dorigo in 1992. Particle Swarm Optimization was introduced by Kennedy and Eberhart in 1995. Storn and Price introduced Differential Evolution in 1996. K.M. Passino introduced Bacterial Foraging Optimization Algorithm in 2002. In 2003, X.L. Li proposed Artificial Fish Swarm Algorithm. Artificial Bee Colony algorithm was introduced by Karaboga in 2005. 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. In this paper, Satish Gajawada proposed The Human Optimization. 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.”

Abstract of article [4] is shown below as it is:

“The goal of this article is:

- 1) To popularize "Artificial Human Optimization" field
- 2) To show opportunities that exist in "Artificial Human Optimization" field.

- 3) To Design an optimization method based on Artificial Humans
- 4) To show reviews of papers in “Artificial Human Optimization” field
- 5) To make corrections to my previews work in “Artificial Human Optimization” field
- 6) To encourage researchers across the globe to work in “Artificial Human Optimization” field
- 7) To give Artificial Human Optimization award to researchers who contributed to this new field”

Abstract of article [5] is shown below as it is:

“Global Optimization Techniques like Genetic Algorithms, Particle Swarm Optimization, Ant Colony Optimization and other optimization techniques were used in literature to solve complex optimization problems. Many optimization algorithms were proposed in literature by taking the behavior of Birds, Ants, Fishes, Chromosomes etc. as inspiration. Recently, a new trend has begun in Evolutionary Computing Domain where optimization algorithms have been created by taking Human Behavior as inspiration. The focus of this paper is on optimization algorithms that were and are being created based on the behavior of Artificial Humans. In December 2016, a new field titled “Artificial Human Optimization” was proposed in literature. This paper is strongly meant to popularize “Artificial Human Optimization” field like never before by showing an Ocean of Opportunities that exists in this new and interesting area of research. A new field titled “Artificial Economics Optimization” is proposed at the end of paper.”

2. Reviews

This section shows reviews of articles [1] – [5] in Artificial Human Optimization field.

2.1. 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.

2.2. 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.

2.3. Review 3

Nothing to evaluate.

2.4. Review 4

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

2.5. 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.

2.6. 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.

2.7. 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.

2.8. 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.

2.9. 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.

2.10. 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.

2.11. 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.

2.12. Review 12

We had a glance at your published article "POSTDOC : THE HUMAN OPTIMIZATION". We found your article very innovative, insightful and interesting. We really value your outstanding contribution towards Scientific Community.

2.13. Review 13

The author have come up with a new approach of academia; Philosophy Of a Doctor (PoD) – A New Degree. I am not expert in this area and would suggest to send the work to some academic. I think this is not a suitable workshop for such work. It should be send to some academic workshop/conference/journal.

2.14. Review 14

Literature review: very good.

Experiments: None.

Overall a good writing but check if it is in the scope of the conference of PAKDD!

2.15. Review 15

The author, Satish Gajawada has proposed a new area Artificial Human Optimisation – An Introduction. The author has proposed an optimisation algorithm but there has been no application used to test the algorithm or the optimisation method on. More experiments are required. Also its not related to data mining and not in the scope of PAKDD or BDM.

2.16. Review 16

The author note" This article got recently published in "Transactions on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence". I have copyrights with me. I am submitting this paper for re-publishing in your workshop in an attempt to popularize "Artificial Human Optimization" like never before." suggests that the work is already published so there is not point accept him for re-publication since the proceedings of this workshop will be published. New and interesting area though.

2.17. Review 17

We are very happy to inform you that your paper has been accepted (conditionally) for publication in journal. Our journal is a prestigious journal and it will be indexed in major indices ASAP. Please modify your paper based on reviewers comment, otherwise it will not be accepted for publication.

Type of paper : Research
Significance of the main idea(s) : Average
Originality : Average
Technical quality of the paper : Average
Awareness of related work : Average
Clarity of presentation : Average
Organization of the manuscript : Very Poor
References : Average
Paper Length : Average
How comfortable are you in reviewing this paper? : Confident
Overall comments and changes that MUST be made before Publication: The manuscript is not organized. The presentation is not clear.
Overall Recommendation: Marginally Accept.

2.18. Review 18

The Paper captioned “Ph.D: The Human Optimization” presented by the author has been reviewed in detail by the reviewers and found it a distinctive effort. Reviewers offer following remarks:
The paper is strongly prepared to provide technical grounds of the subject. The Introduction elucidates the essence of the proposed research. Besides, Literature Review carefully outlined with details focused on the current applicable methods. The author intelligently developed the remaining part of the manuscript communicating the commitment and the pragmatic knowledge of the writer. The mathematical expressions were also strongly used to defend the current work. The methodology adopted showed proper evaluation and documentation. In this manner, it is acknowledged for publication as it is.

2.19. Review 19

The paper “Scientist: International Association of Artificial Human Optimization” developed generously that shows the technical grounds of the subject. The technical expertise has been greatly utilized in developing the paper under review. The Introduction endorsed systematically the extensive areas of the new study approach. Besides, Literature Review well explains and advocates the probe and gaps in this area of research. The author skillfully produced the rest of the manuscript exploring in depth this newly proposed area. Moreover, the optimization method is well devised and the reviewer’s comments on previous work are also commendable. In this manner, it is acknowledged for publication as it is.

2.20. Review 20

The Paper captioned “Hero: Transactions on Artificial Human Optimization” has been carefully reviewed by the authorities and declared it a well-composed paper. Reviewers offer following remarks: The abstract focused on the rationale of the research in a logical way that seems to be a unique angles of the study. The Introduction of the paper well argued the true methodology of the research. Moreover, Literature review is carefully organized, covers the available methods with suitable details. Rest of the manuscript gradually covers the focused point of view that shows the applied knowledge of the authors. The paper also presents the relevant mathematical details with sufficient reference to the existing work. The methodology adopted showed proper evaluation and documentation. Therefore, it is accepted for publication as it is.

2.21. Review 21

The article contributes greatly on the areas of Artificial Intelligence. Researcher excellently worked on the area of study. Collectively, it is a great effort and the reviewers provided following comments about the manuscript. Abstract covers all the important aspects of the proposed methodology and well written in general. The essence of the presented approach is elaborated nicely in the Introduction section. Similarly, Literature review is organized well. Rest of the manuscript is also very well structured representing the dedication and knowledge of the researcher about the topic and skill on research. The manuscript shall be rated high on its technical quality. Therefore, manuscript shall be accepted for publication as it is.

2.22. Review 22

The Paper captioned “Artificial Human Optimization –An Introduction” has been wisely appraised by the authorities and declared it a well-conceived paper. Reviewers offer following remarks:
The abstract previews the author’s approach and improved theories of the study that definitely yet to be explored and never produced before. The research procedure as described in the Introduction is exemplary. Moreover, Literature review is best framed, focus the information on the potential approaches with applicable facts. Rest of the manuscript gradually covers the ideal point of view that shows the applied knowledge of the authors. The paper also presents the relevant mathematical details with sufficient reference to the existing work. The methodology adopted showed proper evaluation and documentation. Therefore, it is accepted for publication as it is.

2.23. Review 23

Information for the Contribution

1. Writing Skill and Quality (0-10): 8
2. Quality of content (0-10): 8
3. Fitness of title (0-10): 9
4. Significance for theory or practice (0-10): 9
5. Contribution and Originality (0-10): 9
6. Level of Innovation (0-10): 8
7. Quality of presentation (0-10): 8
8. Ripple effect to other authors (0-10): 10
9. Decisive overall recommendation (0-10): 9

In this paper the author clearly explains the research with effective method and good description. The topic is meaningful, and the research results are interesting to many specialized readers. So it's good work and acceptable.

Some more checkpoints for improving the quality of the final version (if need, author can pay attention to below checkpoints. It's not requirements but just comments for improving the paper)

- In abstract and Introduction, if need, the main goal can be say more clearly.
- The abstract can shows some information to understand the goal of this paper clearly, if need.
- The introduction can be emphasized the background and motivation more clear way.
- the results need reflect more clear explanation.
- Are there any not good phrases?, if so the authors need to pay attention to them.
- Are there any typos? If so, it need to be revised.
- Although paper is good from language point of view, but a little bit review towards sentences and/or grammars can turn it into beautiful paper.
- In conclusion, should elaborate why the study is important and the significance of the study more clearly.
- Overall, it's very interesting and the work proposed is useful, the paper is organized well and the presentation is clear.

2.24. Review 24

We reviewed your paper, Artificial Human Optimization - An Introduction, and found it very impressive. However the competition for publication in this journal is very intense, so we cannot manage the publication of your paper right now. Nevertheless, we cordially recommend you to resubmit your paper after revision or to submit your paper with new research results for the next issues.

I have never reviewed this kind of paper. This paper analyzes published and unpublished work from the "Artificial Human Optimization" field proposed by the author of the paper in his previous work. The author of the paper also provides in Section 2 corrections of the previously published work. The reviewers' comments on previously published work is analyzed in Section 4. In section 8. ARTIFICIAL HUMAN OPTIMIZATION AWARDS the list of authors awarded "Artificial Human Optimization Award" is provided. Who gave the award, what kind of award it is...?. In Conclusion of the paper author states that the "paper shows how to contribute to new field titled "Artificial Human Optimization". I don't think that there should be paper describing to other how to work, research in a field. It is unclear what the purpose of the paper is? The title of the proposed paper ARTIFICIAL HUMAN OPTIMIZATION - AN INTRODUCTION is not in sync with the paper content. The goals provided in the abstract like "to popularize "Artificial Human Optimization" field", "to show opportunities that exist in "Artificial Human Optimization" field", "to Design

an optimization method based on Artificial Humans”,, “to give Artificial Human Optimization award to researchers who contributed to this new field” are either not provided in the paper (i.e. one figure and half page of text is not enough to cover goal “to Design an optimization method based on Artificial Humans”) or are more suited for public announcement than a paper in the journal.

2.25. Review 25

You may not submit "Artificial Human Optimization" because its content has been deemed by the moderators to be inappropriate for our forum. However, you may submit other articles of yours that are published with a resolving DOI. Please note that your submission privileges may be withdrawn again if you do not agree to follow our policies. Our moderators are not tasked with providing reviews with their decisions. For such feedback you would need to use another forum. To be clear: Resubmission of variants on "Human Optimization" will result in the permanent loss of your submission privileges. Submission of unpublished work will result in the removal of the article without further consideration. You are welcome to submit articles that have already appeared in journals (other than the aforementioned paper).

3. Conclusion

25 reviews of papers in Artificial Human Optimization field (AHO field) are shown in this paper. This is a new kind of research paper where the focus is to show reviews obtained for a particular innovative and very new work from different experts. Most of the reviews obtained for the papers in AHO field are very extreme. Some reviews are like “Very interesting”, “Very novel”, “Very impressive” etc. whereas some reviews are like “very funny”, “there is no research” etc.

When optimization methods based on ants, fishes, birds, bacteria, chromosomes, bees etc are proving their strength then it is expected that optimization methods based on Artificial Humans will also work. There are already more than 15 papers published in AHO field.

If you have very new and innovative idea in your mind and you got reviews like “Strong reject” or “funny” for your work then the author of this paper recommends that the paper should be submitted to another expert/publisher. This is the lesson learnt from this paper.

References

- (1) Satish Gajawada; Entrepreneur: Artificial Human Optimization. Transactions on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence, Volume 4 No 6 December (2016); pp: 64-70
- (2) Satish Gajawada, “CEO: Different Reviews on PhD in Artificial Intelligence”, Global Journal of Advanced Research, vol. 1, no.2, pp. 155-158, 2014.
- (3) Satish Gajawada, “POSTDOC : The Human Optimization”, Computer Science & Information Technology (CS & IT), CSCP, pp. 183-187, 2013.
- (4) Satish Gajawada, “Artificial Human Optimization – An Introduction”, Transactions on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence, Volume 6, No 2, pp: 1-9, April 2018.
- (5) Satish Gajawada, “An Ocean of Opportunities in Artificial Human Optimization Field”, Transactions on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence, Volume 6, No 3, pp: 25-32, June 2018.