**Los referees se quejaban de dos cosas. Una eran los experimentos, que eran pocos y pocas comparaciones y medids estadísticas sobre la accuracy, compexity etc… Este problema lo ha superado antoniocon su magnifico estudio de los 93 casos.**

**La segunda queja era sobre las referencias. Uno de los referees hablaba de la falta de algunas refeencias y da una lista sin autores ni journals, solo títulos .Casi todas ellas son de Le Zhang o Suganthan, creo que uno de ellos es el referee.**

**A parte de las consideraciones en mi ultimo email aquí va una lista de sugerencias para valorar si hacemos los cambios o no. Please check!!**

Para darle satisfacción yo introduciría estos dos párrafos donde indico en el paper para darle satisfacción:

Pag 2 paragraph 3 line -3. I would change

“*Accordingly, a number of proposals have aimed at ameliorating this situation by inducing oblique partitions (e.g., Murthy, Kasif, and Salzberg 1994; Wickramarachchi et al. 2016; Cantu-Paz and Kamath 2003)*”

by

“*Accordingly, a number of proposals have aimed at ameliorating this situation by inducing oblique partitions (e.g., Murthy, Kasif, and Salzberg 1994; Wickramarachchi et al. 2016; Cantu-Paz and Kamath 2003) and oblique decision tree ensemble variants (e.g. Menze et al. 2011; Zhang and Suganthan 2014; Zhang and Suganthan 2015; Zhang and Suganthan 2017; Zhang et al. 2017and Qiu et al. 2017 )”*

Pag 4 paragraph 4 line -2. I would change

*“…trees (see Cantu-Paz and Kamath 2003; and Wickramarachchi et al. 2016 for an overview).”*

by

*“…trees. More concretely Menze et al. (2011) propose the use of oblique random forests (oRF) which explicitly learn optimal split directions at internal nodes using linear discriminative models, rather than using random coefficients as the original oRF; Zhang* *and Suganthan (2014) propose a new method to increase the diversity of each tree in the forests and thereby improve the overall accuracy by building the Random Forests with two projection methods Principal Component Analysis and Linear Discriminate Analysis**; Zhang and Suganthan (2015) propose a new method for oblique trees based on multisurface proximal support vector machine; Zhang et al. (2017)* *propose to use a more powerful proximal SVM to obtain oblique hyperplanes to capture the geometric structure in the context of visual tracking; ; Zhang and Suganthan (2017) propose an efficient co-trained kernel ridge regression method and a random vector functional link network ensemble that outperform the behavior of classical classifiers; Qiu et al. (2017) study the oblique random forest in the context of time series forecasting by using a least square classifier to perform partitions. Some others excellent reviews on ensemble learning are Dietterich (2000); Rokach (2010) and Ren et al. (2016) where the authors explains why ensembles can often perform better than any single classifier and reviews traditional as well as state-of-the-art ensemble methods. ”*
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**Minor comments**

Pag 3, Section Background, paragraph 2, line 3 : Rp should be with the R of real numbers (hay mas sitios en el documento, hacer búsqueda y reemplazar)

Pag 4, paragraph 1, last line: in the formula for \hat{\theta}\_{m}^j the *arg* should be change by *arg min\_{\theta\_m^j}*.

Pag 4, paragraph 2, line -1: Figure 1 1 should be Figure 1.

Pag 5, paragraph -2, line 3: “. Furthermore, the projections of these prisms in the subspace of Rp defined by X still reproduce a linear orthogothal partition of this space” Yo creo que esto no es verdad. La proyección del prisma en Rp da una partición NO lineal. ¿No? o hay algo que no entiendo?

Pag 6, last paragraph, line -5: “Compare to the exaustive search for oblique decision boundaries (O(2p × (n p)), in Murthy, Kasif, and Salzberg 1994), or an algorithm such as HHCART, which has complexity of O(Cp2nlog(n)) (where C is the number of classes in classification problems, Wickramarachchi et al. 2016). “ esta frase no está acabada o al menos yo no la entiendo!!

Pag 11, first paragraph, last line: decimos “4-fold” en el siguiente párrafo (línea 3) decimos 10-fold cross validation. Cual de las dos es la que utilizamos??

Pag 12, haciendo referencia a Figura 8 “Moreover, there are notable differences between the use of orthogobal and IBF...”. Esta figura solo muestra orthogonal por tree, random forest y evolutionary trees pero no muestra IBF. Otra opción es que no entienda la figura o este Moreover haga referencia a las figuras siguientes.

Pag 12, paragraph -2, line -5: Table 4 should be Table 3.

Pag 14, paragraph 5, line 1 “...the proportion of the majority class m, we can see that the...” should be changed to “...the proportion of the majority class m, we can see in Figure 15 that the...”

Figure 2 en la leyenda aparece una Y y al lado del circulo una O y al lado del triangulo una D y no está explicado que es eso.

Figure 3 es la proyección en el plano X1, X2 de X3=X1^2. Por lo tanto los ejes son X1 y X2 no es X2=X1^2. Es decir yo quitaba del eje X2=X1^2 y dejaba simplemente X2.