



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_26412
Title of the Manuscript:	A Hybrid Cascade Approach for Human Skin Segmentation
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	- The comparison with other state of the art methods is not relevant in this paper. The authors show only the results of skin segmentation on some images. The methods should be compared in terms of algorithm results (precision, recall), eventually execution time etc. - What is the actual number of the images where the proposed method was compared to other methods ? - On pag. 108, Table 1. It is not clear if the results were obtained on the training stage or for the test images - The algorithm should be tested on a publicly available database, not on a database collected by the authors. In this way other methods could be compared in the future with this algorithm.	• Indeed, in this section “experimental results”, two comparisons have been conducted: the first is a visual comparison; the second is a quantitative comparison using two metrics: recall and false alarm. • The performance of the proposed method was evaluated on our own constructed gesture dataset, which is composed of a maximum of 300 images. Additionally, a sample comprised out of 30 image was randomly selected from the dataset and manually segmented to build the ground truth. • The images presented in figure 8 are not from our own dataset. They are the same images used by the methods indicted. • To make this point more clear, the caption text of this Table has been re-edited in the revised version of the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- AdaBoost is sometimes spelled adaBoost (for example, pag. 5) - pag. 6, Probably Approximately Correct: first write the full name of the concept, and then use the abbreviation - There are some isolated spelling errors in the document	• It is corrected in this version. • Also this is addressed current revision • The manuscript has been revised from another one of our work group to inspect all typos found.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- The authors could use information gain in order to determine the influence each color channel has to the segmentation result (for example the value channel from the HSV color space) - Simple, well known concepts are described in too much detail (for example, RGB to HSV conversion)	The effect of V channel on the overall segmentation performance has been investigated and the obtained results have proved that this colour Channel is very advantageous for segmentation accuracy. Indeed, some much more details about the process of colour conversion can be omitted, however it is likely that such details may be informative and allow the work to be more understandable to undergraduates and beginning researchers.