



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	The authors propose a set of medical image processing techniques intended for improving breast cancer detection using mammogram. These techniques seem to be reasonable. However, after the sample images are processed, there is no evaluation of the effectiveness, sensitivity, specificity, and so forth of the proposed techniques. Table 2 lists the output of a Fuzzy Inference System. It is mysterious how the features in the three images are categorized into calcification, mass, and stellate lesion. In addition, these results have to be compared with the radiologists' judgement, and if possible, the pathological results. There are no image selection criteria. It is not clear how the image features are identified.	This has been done. This study evaluated the proposed system using detection rate. The study has identified the original images affected by cancer indicators and the type of cancer indicator that each image is characterized by. This is as identified by the database in which the images were derived from. However, this study now compares the cancer indicators in the original images with the ones that the system categorized. The original images were selected purposively from the Minimias database. This is to ensure that the selected images were affected by the three cancer indicators.
Minor REVISION comments	The authors present some background information that either would not interest the potential readers, or is not relevant to the topic, such as breast cancer and staging. The breast cancer indicators in mammogram are relevant, but the authors need to focus on their imaging features. I wonder if more than three images are processed using the proposed techniques. If not, the reader cannot see how well the techniques work in a large amount of	The section describing breast cancer and its stages have been removed. The number of images has been increased to 20.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	images.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors may need to briefly discuss how the proposed image processing technique can be used clinically.	The clinical use of the system has been discussed.