



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_6547
Title of the Manuscript:	Audio CODECs using the interpolation "LSM" and comparison with PCM
Type of the Article	Short Communication

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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	In this paper, 3 methods of polynomial fitting are presented to perform audio compression. All of them used LSM (Least squares method), which was relative mature and easily found in many simulation tools. Although, LSM was mentioned in Abstract and Introduction, but the author have not shown any contribution on this method. Actually, polynomial fitting was explained and implemented in the experiments. The author also compared results from the proposed methods and results from PCM (Pulse-code modulation). However, PCM is a method to convert analog signal to digital format but it is not a compression method, even though it will introduce quantization noise. Thus the comparison with PCM is not helpful. Besides these, I have several comments as follows. 1) The part of audio samples modeling is confusing. The author has not clearly explained the variable x in equation 1. How to know the values of x? Equation 3 was not well derived. 2) The effectiveness of the third method on convergence has not been explained. 3) Please use different y-axes for SNR and r% for Figure 1, 2 and 6. 4) In section 4, results are not well explained and figures are not readable. For example, in figure 3, there are no x-axes labels especially for SNR (column 3). In figure 4, please explain the more attenuation at low frequency with CMR=1/4. For figure 5, please show the SNR of the original signal. The SNR plots of the results from 2	We rearranged the paper totally. We put flowcharts and detailed explanation about the steps and the experiments and the results. All the algorithms rewritten in a sufficient way and we fixed all the typos in the Psudocodes. We reviewed the paper with New Mexico Tech writing centre and modified all language mistakes.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	methods show the difference at low frequency. Is it due to the low frequency noise introduced by the first method or the distortion caused by the second method? 5) Extensive English editing is required.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please clearly state the experiment setup and explain the results.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		