SDI Review Form 1.6

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**

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	Please add a paragraph to compare features and performance of the proposed implementation with the other GPU-based mobile implementations in the results, discussion, or conclusion section. The volume rendered images by the Box-spline interpolation seem smaller than the ones by the linear interpolation, please explain the reason in the paper. It seems the simple linear interpolation is better than the Box-spline interpolation, why do you use the Box-spline interpolation?	-High quality -Reasonable performance
Minor REVISION comments	1. line 34, "[1].Nowadays," -> "[1]. Nowadays," 2. All queations and mathematical characters are blurred. 3. line 241, "i.e.3D textures" -> ", i.e., 3D textures" 4. line 264, "al. [5].They" -> "al. [5]. They"	Removed accordingly
Optional/General comments		