



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_22588
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Self-Organizing Feature Map and Counter Propagation Network in Face Recognition
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	1. The aim of this investigation, i.e. comparison of SOFM and counter propagation CPN techniques in face recognition has not been established properly in the manuscript. In the conclusion part it is partly detailed using 2 to 3 lines. 2. The objective of this investigation is not clearly presented. Why such type of investigation is required must be presented. 3. Although there are many illumination normalization techniques. Authors have only considered histogram equalized method. Justification must be given. And authors must present the illumination variant images that have been accomplished during this research. 4. Author(s) must correct the information in line number 212. Colour image is not a 3D image. 3D form of data can only be obtained from three coordinates and it is preserved in 3D image not in colour image. 5. What is the method that extracts RoI in figure 2(b) from figure 2(a). It must be detailed. If it is a manual process, it must be stated. 6. Training time or recognition time are particularly dependent on machine. Standalone system may took much time where as mainframe may took less time. Parallel computing may also be useful. Author(s) must also present their system detail. 7. Author(s) has performed their experiment on	Comparison has been changed to performance evaluation. Local histogram equalization was used for contrast enhancement Corrected. It was conversion from colour image to grayscale. It was manual process The implementation tool used was MATLAB R2012a version on Windows 7 Ultimate 32-bit operating system, Intel®Pentium® CPU B960@2.20GHZ Central Processing Unit, 4GB Random Access Memory and 500GB hard disk drive. Black African database was used (240 neutral face images). Sensitivity (i.e. True Positive Rate) was included. Because 6 different neutral faces were captured per individual, where 4 out of 6 were used for training and remaining 2 for testing per individual. This paper used back propagation neural network as supervised and Counter propagation Network as unsupervised but I



SDI Review Form 1.6

	frontal face images. The database description must be well established. It is suggested to consider popular face databases for such experiments. Database detail is also missing. Other than recognition rate, different face recognition challenges must also be considered for this comparison. 8. Why number of testing image is less than training image. The reverse must also be examined and reported. 9. English language and Grammar must also be improved accordingly. Plagiarism Issue- Not Same but similar type of work has been done in the paper entitled as 'Illumination Invariant Face Recognition using Supervised and Unsupervised Learning Algorithms.'	used Self-Organizing Feature Map as unsupervised network and Counter Propagation Network as hybrid of unsupervised and supervised network (outstar rule).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		