|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Journal Name: | [**Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science**](https://journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_JAMCS\_131280** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **ON ENSEMBLE LEARNING: CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MACHINE LEARNING MODEL BY MODELING AN ESTIMATOR BASED ON AGGREGATION METHODS** |
| Type of the Article | **Original Research Article** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** |  |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** |  |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. |  |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. |  |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** |  |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? |  |  |
| Optional/General comments | This paper is well written and clear but there are some points that I noticed in this research  1.There are a lot of mathematical formulas that are difficult to read they should be written in more detail especially the symbols and equations within this research.  2.The proposed method does not have any comparison with other methods to know the superiority of this method over other methods, so there should be more comparisons and a review of the results.  3.This paper lacks real-world experimental results and without these results it is difficult to evaluate effectiveness in a meaningful way Lady-Forest.  4.There are some old references, for example in 2002 and 2000.  5.It can be said that the presented research is an innovative research on group education and is considered promising in this field, but it lacks experimental investigation. | 1. Yes, the majority of the symbols have been interpreted in order to provide greater clarity and precision. 2. Thanks to its learning mechanism, MaxEnsForest surpasses the classical stacking method by progressively optimizing the reduction of prediction errors at each aggregation level. Unlike traditional stacking, which relies on a simple static combination of predictions, MaxEnsForest dynamically adjusts the weights of the estimators based on their performance, thereby enhancing the robustness and generalization capacity of the model. Regarding data management, we recommend a K-fold cross-validation strategy, which allows the training dataset to be divided into several balanced subsets. This approach aims to reduce the risks of overfitting and underfitting, thus ensuring a better evaluation of the model's performance on unseen data. 3. The objective of this article was primarily to propose a machine learning estimator, providing all possible details, including the underlying mathematical foundations of this approach. Thus, the experimentation can be the subject of a future dedicated article. 4. We have taken note and adjusted our references. 5. Thank you, we have duly noted that. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **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)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this**  **manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |