SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJMCS_19044**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Real-Time Volume Rendering of FCC Datasets Using Box-Splines on the Mobile Platforms**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**New Comments**	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
Previous Comments: It is not clear where the contribution / improvement of the provided work is. I urge the authors in include a clear paragraph in the introduction section to clarify this issue. Contribution is added up in introduction part and can be seen because its highlighted in yellow **----------**	**I thank the author/s for their on-point corrections.**	Thank you very much for your kind words.
Previous Comments: The figures in the manuscript looks very blurry. (So does the formulas). I am suspecting that the authors use a different formula editor and copied these graphics into the manuscript. I think for a better presentation the burry figures need to be re-designed, possibly with an editor having true font capabilities. Figures and equations are managed properly **----------**	**I thank the author/s for their on-point corrections.**	Thank you very much for your kind words.
Previous Comments: L229 - L237: the material here is essential for understanding the hardware that the experiments are conducted on. However, Figure 4, and the rest of the section 3.4 provides completely redundant details that has nothing to do with the experiments provided in the manuscript. I urge the authors to consider removing the remaining parts of section 3.4, possibly extending the first paragraph slightly.	**I thank the author/s for their clarifications.**	Thank you very much for your kind words.

Section 3.4 is edited as per guidelines **----------**		
Previous Comments: Section 4.3. L308-313: This paragraph is contains confusing information in multiple aspects. I would urge the authors to consider revising this paragraph. **- It is claimed that the author's implementation is not optimized for speed. In a manuscript where the authors claim to reach interactive performance this is an unacceptable situation. The authors should either revise their claims, or they should implement a method that is optimized for speed and provide the reader the specifics, or the experiments should be conducted using a well-known state-of-the-art method.** **- The changes of the author's shader implementation should also be at least mentioned in the aformentioned paragraph.** We will implement the method in our future work **----------**	**I still think if there are any fine details about the author/s' shader implementation, that should be mentioned in the manuscript. If it is a generic implementation, then the readers should be at least directed (via a citation perhaps, or a Web site as a footnote) to the details of this implementation. Because since it is claimed that the author/s' implementation is not optimized for speed these details would be essential for the understanding of the reader.**	You raise an important point, thank you for this suggestion. For the understanding purpose we added some pieces of shader code in section 4.3 as per your instructions**.**
Previous Comment: L316-320: the information in this paragraph is redundant in this chapter, though i also agree that this information is essential for correct understanding. I urge the authors to consider moving the contents of this paragraph into hardware specifications section (3.4) The paragraph is edited following the guidelines **----------**	**I thank the author/s for their efforts.**	Thank you very much for your kind words. We are grateful for the time and energy you expended on our behalf.
Previous Comments: - Table 1 and 2: The only comparison is done with respect to linear interpolation, and according this comparison linear interpolation works 25 times faster than the proposed method, Which renders this manuscript unpublishable. Either: **- Present results of the state-of-the-art techniques that are mentioned in the background section** **- Provide a set of compatible well-known methods that attempts to tackle with the same problems/complications and their comparisons.** **- Provide clear description where the proposed method/s contribute positively to the literature.**	**I still believe that the author/s should compare, or at least list the reasons why their methods are preferable to linear interpolation more clearly (instead of just mentioning it via figures, I believe the quality improvement with respect to linear interpolation deserve at least a clarifying paragraph so that it is not missed). But I also want to thank the author/s for their meticulous corrections for making the manuscript better.**	**In result section, we tried to explain the reason why our method is preferable, hope it makes the point clear.** In the comparison of rendering with the FCC box-spline interpolation, it is conspicuous that our algorithm has good image quality, even though it employs only half of the dataset but still getting along with linear interpolation. Hence spline evaluation is an expensive operation and have limited support, we get a low frame rate. Further, it should be brought into amount that linear interpolation is hardwired on the graphics hardware according to what, it is much more time efficient.

-Figure 6: Captions need to be revised. **- Figure 6: Figures can be smaller in size, the details will still be visible.** **----------** Previous Comment: Chapter 3: The description of the techniques is comprehensive and I thank the authors for their careful work. However, these details took quite long covering a very large portion of the manuscript. I would consider shortening the material in this section, since it actually is just literature work, not the contributions of the work that you have presented. Chapter 3: I would also like to see a detailed comparison of the techniques (Not necessarily as result, a technical discussion would also suffice) in terms of the related contributions. (Which ones produce the better result, which are suitable for online execution, what are the pros and cons of different methods and etc.) A Spell Check throughout the manuscript is necessary. There are a few spelling/grammar mistakes that can easily be corrected, such as: L53: present --> presented L54: ... algorithm we --> algorithm, we L77: required --> require L161: straight forward --> straightforward L162: surface shaded --> surface-shaded L182: consider revising L262: we developed --> we have developed Spelling mistakes and other common mistakes are being removed as per guidelines and also thank you so much for appreciation ----------	I thank the author/s for their on-point corrections.	Thank you once again for your valuable comments and suggestions. We are hopeful that our supplementary analyses and revised focus helps to improve your opinion of work.