



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_38072
Title of the Manuscript:	Novel technique for IRFPA blind pixels detection
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>)

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	Please revise abstract – should include problem statement, aim, methods, results, analysis, conclusion Too many keywords – please reduce 4 or 5 keywords only	Thank you very much, it was a very helpful advice. 1. Abstract modified and be more specific according to your recommendation 2. Keywords have reduced, also.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	How to validate the results? Reference based from which technique – perhaps from different sensors? Or else?	We are validating the result on the same sensor. In our university labs we have a blackbody device and optical bench in physics department where we test the system for RBNUC technique to extract the lookup tables as same as manufacturer does. According to your gentle and important question, we reviewed the result clause and made it more detailed besides adding more figures (3, 4, 5, and 10) and simplify some paragraphs by adding more details.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Check font size - inconsistent	Thank you again. We fixed this issue, also Thank you very much, Sir.