



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_25712
Title of the Manuscript:	Plain Text Encoding/Decoding Technique Using a Combination of Huffman and Run-Length Algorithms.
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The weakness of this paper: 1. There is no specific in nature reflecting fundamental issues need to be solved. The author proposes the existing techniques that have already done. The author proposes Huffman encoding before RLE. The computation of Huffman code before RLE requires high computational power. If the data size is large, the proposed method of Huffman code-RLE will consume high computational and time consuming. The author should be determined the characteristic of data input to be applied in the experiments. 2. The author should add one or two columns in table 1 to show the result of Huffman code from ASCII code in binary. The author can justify the result from Huffman code, Huffman code-RLE and RLE-Huffman code. 3. Most of experimental results produce fail in reducing file size. Is it depend on the size of source data type? Please justify and explain it. The strength of this paper: The experimental results show that the proposed method can reduce the data size using Huffman then RLE.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	The abstract should be written a concise summary. Rewrite the abstract by following the sequences properly: 1. Problem statement 2. objectives 3. Research methodology 4. experimental results 5. significance of the output Figure 3 doesn't give any information, I suggest to remove that figure.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ferda Ernawan
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia