



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_11944
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW OF WAVELET-BASED IMAGE PROCESSING METHODS FOR FINGERPRINT COMPRESSION IN BIOMETRIC APPLICATION
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Are the wavelet-based compression methods the best for fingerprint compression? Explain that please. In my opinion, the content of section 2.2 is shallow, at least in comparison to the theory given in previous sections. Provide more technical details regarding every considered method, please. The paper can be longer. I would like to suggest to put a table as a final result of the paper. The table should provide clearly what quantitative results have been achieved by each method? In the current version of the paper the reader cannot identify which of the considered method is the best?	1) Additional explanations have been provided with respect to different image signal processing methods from page 6 to 12. 2) This paper is a review of wavelet methods. The additional information provided in pages 6-12 compared wavelet with other signal processing methods. 3) The manuscript is a review paper not a quantitative research paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The last considered method has been proposed in 2012, maybe something new has been published later?	Similar work done in 2013 by Singla et al has been reviewed and included.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In my opinion the paper provides a good theoretical background to wavelets and to fingerprints theories but the following comparative study does not take into account that theory. For that reason the paper may be received by the readers as a bit shallow.	Additional information has been provided in pages 6-12 to address the reviewer's concerns.