



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14781
Title of the Manuscript:	EEG Feature Extraction in Brain-Mobile Phone Interfaces
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 <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	- Authors used different frequency and threshold to classify for frequency spectrum and PSD methods. So are these results reliable?	<u>Agreed for modifications in the text.</u> The results are reliable. 4-15Hz was taken in the frequency analysis just to focus on that range. But the frequency range of 10-20 Hz mentioned in the PSD analysis was just a rough range mentioned for describing the result. Now the text is modified accordingly, in order to avoid the confusion. Regarding different thresholds: PSD Analysis uses a unit of dB/Hz, whereas in Frequency analysis just uses the spectral amplitudes. So different thresholds are taken accordingly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- From lines 93 to 97, authors need to add positions of electrodes and more details of subjects such as: age, sex... - Formulas of frequency spectrum, WVD, PSD, mean power methods should be added	Agreed and modified accordingly
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper is a great view of advances in EEG feature extraction and also shows specific recommendations for future research	