



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_12048
Title of the Manuscript:	A Simple and Unified Method for Automatic Generation of Picture Maze The author changed the title to Picture Maze Generation by Successive Insertion of Path Segment
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 (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	The headings of subsections 5.1 and 5.2, Simple Application 1 and Simple Application 2, respectively, are not well chosen. The reader cannot infer meaningful information from them. Therefore, they should be changed. The heading of section 6, Discussions should be in singular (it is a matter of style, indeed, but 95 out of 100 native English speakers/writers will use singular, if not more.) The heading of subsection 6.1 consists of portions that have uneven font size. Should be changed to uniform. The algorithm in subsection 6.1 and its proof of correctness should be presented more formally. The algorithm should be presented as a pseudocode (at least) with detailed steps and appropriate constructs; the proof should be formatted as a theorem in the manner established in theoretical computer science. Figure 22 is of unacceptably low quality. Should be redone with appropriate resolution and no pixelization. The above applies to figures 23 and 24 as well.	5.1 and 5.2 were combined and rewritten discarding most of previous 5.1. Discussions --- > Discussion The font size is corrected. C program code was added, and Theorem and Proof were rewritten in a little more formal manner. Better outputs were obtained by additional experiments.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Table 1 has strange structure. Its heading is larger than its content. Something should be done to avoid this. Maybe the descriptions can be moved from the table 1 heading to the text of the paper and placed appropriately close to the table. Conclusion(s) section should be expanded. In its current form it says (almost) nothing. Either make it meaningful, or remove it altogether.	The comparison on the table does mean much.. So it was removed. The conclusions were rewritten.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Reference all the prior work relevant to the topic (maze generation). Motivate your study better: what is the difference between picture maze and other types of mazes, what are the possible applications, etc. Explain the choice of the software packages used in your experiments. Are these your own, commercial, or freeware/shareware. Comment on the features that were important in your choice of these packages. In case copyright/licenses/permissions are involved comment on these.	More was given to explain the difference between the picture maze and an ordinary one. I think there is not much to say about the difference between a maze and a picture maze. I think I explained what is a picture maze. The software I used is just the VC++Express 10.0 and the OpenCV win 2.1 packages. Nothing more. Both are free. I wrote all the experimental programs by myself.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper presents a method for generation of picture maze. It references appropriately prior work. However, the referenced work seems to originate in a specific geographic region. It is difficult to believe that no work on this has been done in Europe and/or North America. Related concepts from graph theory (spanning trees, Hamiltonian paths) are introduced. The authors mention the software packages they used in their experimental work. It is a good idea to expand on this. Further, series of examples is used to illustrate the method authors propose and use for maze generation. Authors describe their algorithm, and argue its correctness. Both the algorithm description and the proof of its correctness lack rigour and detail. They deviate significantly from the standards in the field and therefore are unacceptable in this form. Significant expansion and formalization are necessary here. The authors present plenty of examples, illustrating different situations arising in practice and explaining the algorithm's actions and output in these situations. This discussion is appropriately placed and sized. The conclusion(s) section is inadequate and should be rewritten. References should be expanded as per the comment	I searched the references in some databases and could not find new references. So I cannot add new references. The relatively new studies I referenced do not have recent ones in Europe nor North America. I hope they will do the studies. I think it has been revised better. I once read an article written by a puzzle company probably of America. It said much of the puzzle development has been owing to Japanese contributions. The article [5] says. The studies about picture maze generation have not been done much.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	above.	By the way, I changed the paper title: Picture Maze Generation by Successive Insertion of Path Segment
--	--------	--