



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_23171
Title of the Manuscript:	Robust Watermarking for Video Using Modulation Technique on RGB Domain
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	(1) Authors are suggested to introduce the modulation technology, especially for the block mean modulation technology in detail. (2) Authors should compare their algorithm with the similar algorithm in Section 3. (3) The embedding capacity is an important index to evaluate a watermarking algorithm. Authors are suggested to make discussion about these index about their algorithm. (4) Authors should introduce their test data in detail. What is their watermark? How to get the videos of Family and Conference by other researchers? To show the transparency of their algorithm, they also suggested to offer some I-frames with or without watermarking. (5) The conclusion section is terrible. The conclusion should summarize the main results and describe authors' contribution in the paper. I cannot find the compression rate of 26:1 in the whole paper except the conclusion. Authors cannot make new result in conclusion section.	(1) The main steps for block mean modulation are clarified in detail in subsection 2.1.4 (in lines 198-235). (2) A comparison with other researches is given in section 3.2 (in lines 324-327). (3) A discussion was added to subsection 3.2 (in lines 335-346) about capacity of watermark and in figure 8. (4) The secret message is explained in subsection 3.1 (in lines 291-292). The samples (i.e.; Family and conference video). And the effect on I-frame with or without watermarking are explained in section 3 (in lines 266-268) and in figure 3. (5) The results are described in section 3 (in lines 294-297 and lines 320-324) and the conclusion is rearranged in section 4.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(1) Equations are not clear. Authors are suggested to reedit these equations with the software of Mathtype. (2) There are some typos. For example, the last sentence of Introduction should be "The embedding process is based on ...". (3) For the title of subsection 2.1, the semicolon should be removed. (4) For Fig. 1, authors are suggested to describe it in brief in Section 2. (5) If the block mean modulation technology is proposed by authors, they should mark it with the corresponding reference.	(1) The equations rewritten using Mathtype editor, and we hope they became clearer. (2) The typos are corrected in section1 (lines 87-89). (3) The title of subsection 2.1 was corrected. (4) The video watermarking system was explained in detail in section 2 (lines 96-100). (5) A discussion was added about block mean modulation mechanism in subsection 2.1.4 (lines 182-185). And, a new reference is added in line 401.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		