



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	The title of the manuscript suggests that this manuscript reviews wavelet based compression techniques that are used for fingerprint images. Yet, more information are needed: 1) What are the differences between fingerprint image with other biometric images, such as face or palm-print, in terms of compression requirements? This should be highlighted in the manuscript. 2) Sections should be divided properly. For example, "Section 2.0" should become "Section 2", "Section 2.1.1" should become "Section 2.2", and "Section 2.2" should become "Section 3". 3) In the current Section 2.2, the name of the authors should not be in bold. Treat each paragraph as normal paragraph, rather than subsection. 4) How do we know which compression scheme good for fingerprint images? What are the qualitative or quantitative measures used for this judgement? 5) Section 2.2 should give more emphasize on methods for fingerprint images. Currently, only a few methods are related, while the others are mostly wavelet based compression, in general. More critical comments are required.	1) The focus of the paper is on biometric fingerprint image compression and the existing compression standards have been adequately discussed within the framework of a journal article. Other biometric images are beyond the scope of this paper. 2) Sections have be appropriately re-numbered; 3) Bold has been removed from authors names 4) The paper reviewed wavelet based fingerprint compression methods and identified gaps in the existing methods that need to be bridged. 5) A critical review of wavelet-based compression is the focus of the discussion the Section in question.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) On page 4, line 111, it is better to provides the resolutions for the fingerprint image in inches x inches. This is because the resolution in ppi is provided. 2) On page 4, line 111. How 700,000 pixels equal to 0.6 Mbytes? Should it be 0.7 Mbytes? 3) On page 5, line 133. "In order words, ..." should be "In other words, ..." 4) Figure 1.1 should become Figure 1, Figure 1.2 should become Figure 2, and so on. 5) Equation 2.1 should become Equation (1), Equation 2.2 should become Equation (2), and so on.	1) Pixel per inch (ppi) is the standard unit used when dealing with image acquisition. Inch by inch is not appropriate. 2) The source of the information is cited. 700,000 pixels describe the number of picture elements present in the image while 0.6Mbytes describes the amount of storage needed to store the image. The two are not equivalent. 3) Correction has been effected as suggested 4) Correction has been effected as suggested 5) Correction has been effected as suggested
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- None-	