



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6728
Title of the Manuscript:	Expanding Small UAV Capabilities with ANN :A Case Study for Urban Areas Observation
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In section I (last paragraph on your objective), your objective statement is written unclearly: "is to report a system that can analyse images of areas under special areas". I am unsure in reading this, what "areas under special areas" means. This needs to be reworded/stated. 2. In section II-A, you mention the "commercial RC helicopter chosen". Can you specify what type (brand) it is (and maybe even cost)? I think it would be useful for readers to know, since there are an abundance of UAV papers using many different UAVs. By letting the readers know, they can potentially replicate your UAV setup. Also, I don't remember seeing the specifications for the camera used. This would also be useful. 3. In section VI, what brightness adjustment did you use? One from a particular software, a general histogram adjustment, ... what? 4. In section VI (paragraph following Fig. 9) "witch" should be "which"	OK, we changed. OK, we put this information in a footnote Ok, it is done OK, it is done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. In general, there are quite a few English errors (enough not to cite them all) in this paper. I think it is good enough for publication, but having someone go through it for sake of looking at the English would really serve to improve the paper.	Ok, we tried to solve this erros
---	--	----------------------------------