



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_15512
Title of the Manuscript:	Handwritten Arabic Characters Recognition Based on Wavelet Entropy and Neural Network
Type of the 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	In Results and Discussion only 4 persons are involved for gathering the data. This creates question mark on the credibility of the results. On the contrary, in Conclusion it says, "The recognition performance of this method was demonstrated on an Arabic character database of total 27 individual". Please make it clear as to how many individuals were involved in gathering database. Minimum 100 individuals should be involved in order to test the setup satisfactorily, as normally done in research for authenticity. section 2 heading seems missing. is it that "1. Main characteristics of Arabic Writing" is section 2?. If yes, correct the serial number. Flowchart of the system is shown in result and conclusion. This is illogical. It should be somewhere in main description of the experimental setup. Page 3 paragraph 3 literature survey is carried out it. Concerned work is carried in past and is over. It should be referred using present or past perfect tense. past and present tense is very casually use. Decide one strategy and follow it throughout. Instead of propose, write had proposed, or have/has proposed. Check at your end. Reduce introduction. Make it more concise. No need to give excessive reference without using them sincerely Elaborate actual experimental work in more detail.	It was corrected. Corrected done done



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some typo errors. "handwritingindividuality"—space needed Please check space between two words carefully. Space is needed after full stop. These errors may also be introduced if word2010 document is opened in word2007 and the converted to pdf. check at your side All equation numbers should be at same position vertically. Equation 6 is aligned to right. This is not proper. All equations should begin at same indentation. Sometime Table, table and other time Tab. is written. Fix one strategy as per journal requirement, and follow it everywhere in all the research paper	I don't have that in my word version Done done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Too much literature review and introduction. But No any result comparison with concurrent research. Training and testing data should be different. Proper training: Testing ratio like 80:20 should be used for optimal result.	done