



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14383
Title of the Manuscript:	Automated mammogram segmentation using seed point identification and modified region growing algorithm
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1- The item 2 (Materials and Methods) is not about the materials or methods, but it is a review from the literature in the area. I recommend the authors to change the title of this item. I suggest "State of the Art" or something like that. This new item corresponds to the lines 48 to 103. 2 – For similar reasons, I think the lines 104 to 120 should be in the final of the Introduction item. 3 – In the conclusion (line 223), I suggest change "are" for "can be". 4 – Still in the conclusion, in the line 224, the authors wrote "we identified that most of the ROIs obtained...". How many are those? Which percentage of the processed images is same as the identified and labeled by the radiologists?	Changed as LITERATURE REVIEW It is the conclusion of the LITERATURE REVIEW. After changing the item 2 as LITERATURE REVIEW, the position of the lines 104 to 120 is in the apt position. Done Modified the text and explanation is given for 1.Reviwer.
Minor REVISION comments	A few mistakes were committed when writing the paper. I recommend a language review before publication. The authors developed a method and not an algorithm. So, I recommend changing the word "algorithm" to "method" (or something like that) in all the text.	done



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This work proposes an automatic segmentation method for extracting tumors or abnormalities from mammograms. The authors concluded that the developed method is effective and could be used for segmenting abnormal portions of a digital mammogram. The theme is strongly relevant, once breast cancer is one of the main causes of women death in the world and cancer can be considered as an abnormality present in the breast.	