



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The paper is very good and I am about to suggest its publication. However, there are four questions I think that should be corrected. Three minor ones: 1 - In the sentence: "The segmented ROIs are well in agreement with the abnormality portion that are already identified and labeled by the Radiologists" (lines 16-17), just correct the final: "the abnormality portion that is already identified", or "the abnormality portions that are already identified". 2 - Line 223 in the original text is: "The individual ROIs of the segmented images are then used further for feature extraction and classification purpose." So, I suggested that the authors change "are" for "can be" in this sentence. The authors have changed the sentence in the line 220, in the original text. So, I propose a correction for these lines in the text (now 222-225), that should be published as: Finally the gradient operators are used for identifying the boundaries of the segmented region. Using these boundaries, the segmented region of the images are cropped and treated as the ROIs of the mammogram that may constitute the tumor regions. The individual ROIs of the segmented images can be then used further for feature extraction and classification purpose. 3 - I also maintain the idea of changing "algorithm" for "method" in the text, when the authors are talking about their proposition. So it could be done in the lines: 182, 200, 201,208, 219 and 226. And the major problem: I did not see, in the revised text, where the authors answered to the question which I repeat bellow: In the conclusion, in the actual lines 225-227, the authors wrote "By inspecting the extracted ROIs, we identified that most of the ROIs obtained by this segmentation algorithm contain abnormality contents that are already identified and labeled by the Radiologist." How many are those?	Corrected Corrected Corrected Modified by including the number of ROIs that exactly matches with the information given by the Radiologist

Which percentage of the processed 148 images are the same as the identified and labeled by the radiologists? Here, I think a number is required. The most of the ROIs is a very opened matter. I think it is not a good way of concluding a research in a paper. I also suggest change "contain" for "contains" here (The most of the ROIs ... contains...). After correcting these questions, the paper should be published.	Number included Corrected
---	--