



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_29055
Title of the Manuscript:	A De-noising Algorithm of Wavelet Threshold Based on a New Threshold Function
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	Abstract: The author has to add the methodology of the proposed threshold. The main results should be mentioned, how many % improved using the proposed technique. No explanation of Table 2,3,4. Figures 3,4,5 have to be explained comprehensively. Figure 2 should be modified, x-axis and y-axis must be explained. The language used should be improved.	The expression of Traditional threshold selection function is $\lambda = \sigma\sqrt{2\log N}$. Added the percentage of promotion. Tables 2, 3, and 4 have been explained. Figure 3, 4, 5, has a comprehensive explanation. Figure 2 has been modified, x-axis and y-axis has been explained. The language used has been improved.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Change section IV MATLAB SIMULATION EXPERIMENTS to Experimental Results Check the references format. Re-write the conclusion There are several flaws in this paper. It is claimed that "Table 1 quantitatively describe the superiority." Please define the sense of optimally. It is not true to say "the de-noising effect is the best". Many also approached the problem of optimizing noise removal. It is not clear "the anticipated results can be obtained from the experiment."	The title has been modified. Two references are modified. The conclusion has been rewritten. Added the percentage of promotion. These two sentences have been modified or deleted.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>