



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14233
Title of the Manuscript:	Fuzzy Rule Based Additive Noise Removing in Gray Images
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- Currently, there are a few typos and grammatical errors detected in this paper. SUGGESTION: The authors should proof-read the manuscript before re-submission. - The title use the terms "Additive Noise" which is too general. The experiment carried out only use salt-and-pepper noise. Yet, in some literature, salt-and-pepper noise is sometimes classified as multiplicative noise. SUGGESTION: If the authors want to keep this term, please include other type of noise in the experiment, such as Gaussian noise. Otherwise, use "Salt-and-Pepper Noise". - The abstract, the last sentence. It is better if more specific results are given. Such as, the effectiveness based on MSE, and PSNR. - Section 1, first paragraph needs citation. - Section 1, second paragraph. There are too many references in this paragraph. Consider to keep only related references. - Section 1, second paragraph. The citation need to be sequential, i.e., [1], then [2], then [3].... - Figure 1 is not clear. - Page 2, first column, section 2, second paragraph. "Thoms, A. and Aplet, C. J" should be "Thoms and Aplet". "The Figure (1)" should be "Figure 1". (Similarly for Figure 2, etc.) - From Figure 3, how we select the good value for	- The paper is reviewed and typos are removed. - The term Salt and Pepper noise is added into title. - Add the sentence about the measures in abstract. - The citation is made in this section. - These citations are concerned with the necessary methods in the field of noise removing. - The citations are changed according to the BJMCS style. - Figure 1 shows the implementation of fuzzy system to image de- noising - Changed - Changed - After a certain value, the mean square and PSNR values relatively become stable. This figure shows that the certain threshold can be



SDI Review Form 1.6

	alpha? 11. The noise range tested in this experiment is very low, which is not more than 8%. How is the performance of the proposed method, if the noise is at higher level, such as 70%? 12. In Figure 4(d)(e) and (f), the noise seems more than 8%. 13. In Table 2 and Table 3, comparison is done with SMF and fuzzy adaptive median filter. But in Figure 5 and Figure 7, SMF is been replaced by mean filter. Why?	used for alpha. 11. The noise ratio in this test s is kept low, the objective is to hit the noisy pixels. The method works smoothly for higher noise also. 12. The noise ratio is same. 13. Mean filters may be for window size 3 x3, 5x5 or 7x7 and SMF stands for standard mean filter, which is same filter only for 3x3. So there is no difference
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		