



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_23442
Title of the Manuscript:	A new Approach for Automatic Human Recognition Based on Retinal Blood Vessels Analysis
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Feature Extraction it is important stage Not clear and how did you choose the best features 2. Section 4 is too brief and weak. There are not sufficient analyses and comments about experimental results. 3. There are insufficient comments on Figure 12. 4. Is there any relation between diabetic and not diabetic retinal exudates images in your method see reference 5. Computation time not existing I wish the authors good luck with their paper.	1a. A paragraph was added to clarify the used features; a feature vector was established to represent the spatial average edge density distribution. After the pre-processing stage, the ROI or retina area is partitioned into overlapped blocks and the average edge (i.e., vessel) density of each block is calculated and assembled a one element entity in the feature vector. 1b. The use of different kinds of spatial features have been tested using inter/intra scatter ratio analysis. Beside to its low computational requirement it was found that the use of average edge density distribution is sufficient to produce good recognition decisions. 2. Some modifications have been done on section (4) to be more obvious. 3. Some additional comments have been added to comment the results given in figure 12. 4. No this issue was not discussed in this study; the used public dataset includes retina image samples of single type. 5. Our proposed method requires 6.9 seconds to accomplish accurate personal recognition for DRIVE dataset and 8.1 seconds for STARE dataset. In the new paper draft, the value of computation time is been defined.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		