



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13675
Title of the Manuscript:	AUTOMATED DETECTION OF BREAST CANCER'S INDICATORS IN MAMMOGRAM VIA IMAGE PROCESSING TECHNIQUES
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	This paper claims to propose a new method to identify malignant tissues in mammograms. All the techniques that were mentioned in this article are commonly used algorithms in image processing. So there is no new ideas proposed here. Even if the objective of this article was to provide a basic introductory overview to this subject, this paper fails to provide any substantial details describing the steps in this process. Considering that this article does not provide any original methods to detection of breast cancer's identifiers as it claims, nor provides any technical details for the commonly used techniques that it lists,	The techniques used in the paper are not new techniques per say. However, the paper relies on the work of Fu et al. (2005) which detects only micro calcification. This major contribution of this paper is that it introduces an image classification technique which uses both clustering and fuzzy logic techniques to detect the three cancer indicators as opposed to existing methods that only detected one or two indicators. Thus, this work is just an enhancement of an existing method.
Minor REVISION comments	- The citations are in wrong order. - - There are 4 pages of general information mostly from websites before getting to the main subject. - - The image database is not cited. - - Page-5, methods that were mentioned should be cited. - - Need to provide input/output examples for every step in figure-1. -	This has been amended. The number of pages containing general information before the main subject has been reduced. The image database has been cited Appropriate citations have been made on page 5. The input/output of every stage in Figure 1 has been provided.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Tools that were used should be cited. - - There is no discussions about the individual stages, figures 2-5. - - There is no details on the contrast measure technique mention in page-9. - - There is no details on the technique used to measure homogeneity in page-9. - - What kind of correlation method was used in page-9?	The tools have been cited. The stages have been discussed. this work used the gray level co-occurrence matrices to extract these features.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I did not see any technical details or significance in this article. None of the results were discussed, and none of the methods that were named where described. This article neither provides an original idea, nor is detailed and analytic enough to be a tutorial overview.	The methods and results have been appropriately discussed.