



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14611
Title of the Manuscript:	A Neuronal Classification System for Plant Leaves using Genetic Image Segmentation
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	1. Citation style should be improved. 2. Section 1 and 2 are too brief. Please add some explanation and discussion. Points in Section 2 can be tabulated. 3. Formatting: Number of equations. Should not base on section. For example, equation (3.1) should be equation (1) and so on. 4. On page 102, Figure 5 should become Figure 2, and should appear on page 102 or 103. 5. On page 102, Figure 7 should become Figure 3 and should appear on page 102, or 103 (or 104). 6. Please cite the source for equation (5.1) 7. On page 103, 'The best chromosome was obtained at generation 101 as shown in figure 3.' Yet, Figure 4 does not show how to obtain this best value. (More explanation needed). 8. On page 103, sentence before equation (5.3), 'Duraismy2012 and Alireza2011'. The citation style needs to be consistent. 9. Please check matrix A in equation (5.4). If all elements are zero, $\text{conv}(x,A)$ in equation (5.3) will become 0. 10. Section 6 "Experimental validation and results" and Section 7 "Results and Discussion". Only need one section for results.	(1) Corrected (2) The literature reviews has been tabulated and updated (3) This is what Latex is bringing out for me and I think, other published articles in BJMCS also followed this trend. (4) This actually should be figure 5 as I have rightly indicated using Latex programming. My intended figure was really the entire experimental methodology and I think, this is correct. (5) corrected (6) This equation is already cited in the article (see the last line) of this section. (7) The figure shows termination and convergence for GA, hence the best chromosome is obtained at these conditions (8) This has been effected together with the whole references. (9) The equation contains other non-zeros terms which are added to the right-hand side, and thus the value at the left side can be any real value (10) This has been effected in the title of section 6



SDI Review Form 1.6

	11. The appendixes better to be included in the main text. 12. On page 8, conclusion should be stand alone. No need to refer back to Table 3. The paper needs major improvements in terms of formatting. The references need to be numbered accordingly. Typos and grammatical errors are trivial. Need to proof-read before resubmission. Figures need rearrangements.	(11) The conclusion is now standing alone All sections of the papers have been corrected and re-written.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No	