



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
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	This article is well-structured. Also, the explanation of the result is quite clear. I enjoy reading this paper. The main comment is that the further implications is comparative weak in this paper. Thus, the authors need to strength the suggestions and implications in this paper.	Agreed and modified accordingly See section 4
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. It would be better for readers if the methodologies could be improved more clearly. 2. This paper shows some specific results but lacks of discussion. The authors need to add some discussion such as comparing results with the past researches. 3. The authors need to strength the suggestions and implications in this paper.	1. Agreed and modified; See section 2 2. Agreed and modified; See section 3.1 and 3.2 3. Agreed and modified; See section 4
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		