This paper presents a new method for constructing an ensemble using resampling techniques to tackle imbalanced problems. The paper should be rejected due to the following reasons:

1. In the introduction, second paragraph: half paragraph is written two times, which gives a very poor impression as it may indicate that the paper has been written very fast and without reviewing it.
2. Equation of the geometric mean is wrong, as inside of the squared root it appears a summation whilst it should by a product. I thought it was a typo but in the experimental results, when using the geometric mean, results are above 1, which is impossible using it. Therefore, they have wrongly defined it. This is not proper for a prestigious journal and it points out the quality of the paper.
3. The proposal is not clear, the description at the begging of Section 3 is not clear and Figure 1 should be focused on a single partition of data instead of a 10 fold cross validation procedure. In this manner, one could understand easily the figure and the proposal.
4. Reference for DE is wrong; please cite the authors that define it instead of a paper of just 5 years.
5. The entire proposal described in Section 3.1 is not clear at all. It needs to be rewritten from scratch so that is can be understood by new readers. The mathematical symbols has to be properly introduced (m and h in equation 3 are not explained for instance).
6. Why 0.2 is used as p in equation 5 (or who recommends this value? Cite them). What is the meaning of j in Equation 6? I think that the inequalities of Equation 11 are wrong; they should be in the reverse order.
7. In the algorithm before section 4, one wonders where the proposal described in Section 3.1 is used. It should be explained.
8. The experimental analysis is weak:
   1. More ensemble learning methods have to be used. Specifically, those using an evolutionary algorithm to drive the sampling process used to construct each base classifier. There are several proposals in the literature that could be used for this purpose, for instance EUSBoost by Galar et al.
   2. Authors need to add more datasets to the study. According to the description of their datasets, all of them have a low imbalance ratio, IR, (less than 9). Therefore, they need to add more datasets of low IRs and many datasets whose IR is larger than 9.
   3. They should use statistical tests to support their findings as it is usually done in the literature.
   4. Figure 2 is not clear at all. I do not know the purpose of this figure. I strongly recommend introducing the AUC results using a Table as it is done with the geometric mean results.