



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_11689
Title of the Manuscript:	Visual Features for Endoscopic Bleeding 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>)



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	The authors aim to define a set of high-level visual features of endoscopic bleeding and evaluate their capabilities for automatic bleeding detection. The idea that the authors propose is an interesting one, however I find a major problem which needs to be corrected in order for the manuscript to merit publication. The article revolves around the automatic classification of endoscopic images by using visual features. However neither of them (endoscopic images or visual features) is graphically illustrated in the manuscript. Reading the description of the experiment and of the support set allows the reader to get a partial idea on the potential of the method but in order for him to be able to understand the method in its entirety graphical examples should be given: endoscopic images with bleeding (various degrees) and without bleeding, examples of visual features, etc. In the same time illustrative examples should be given for where the method performs well, and where it does not, along with detailed explanations. In the same time, the English language that is being used needs to be improved, so I recommend the authors to revise the manuscript in this concern. The authors should mention if the patients agreed to	An appendix containing 18 images that illustrate the features was included into the paper. For each feature, where possible, both a bleeding and non-bleeding example was provided. Strong and weak points of the presented method, in my opinion, were already described in the text. It is hard for me to add anything. However, I included an efficiency comparison to two bleeding detection algorithm from the literature. I hope this can serve as a more extensive presentation of the method. The paper was checked by an English native speaker, thanks to whom a few tens of language error were corrected Since 2008, according to Polish law, medical data without personal information can be shared to a scientific institute without requiring patients approval. Therefore in this case it was not necessary to ask patients for a permission for analyzing the images. Therefore, the experiment is legal by nature, so I think it might be unnecessary to mention that fact in the paper



SDI Review Form 1.6

	participate in this study.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		