



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_19082
Title of the Manuscript:	Technologies in Texture Analysis - A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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	The paper is very poorly written has many grammatical and formatting errors (even figure captions are missing). The authors simply introduce basic concepts in texture analysis and review four papers related to applications of texture analysis. The presentation and flow of the papers is bad. Being a review paper the authors fails to make any significant or comprehensive analysis of texture analysis. No classification of texture analysis is presented, nor the reason for reviewing specific papers is presented. It looks like four arbitrary papers are reviewed and summarize.	The papers which are found best in their technologies are reviewed. Since the papers reviewed are from different technological fields so no common parameter is found for comparison. English has been taken care of.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comment		