



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_20268
Title of the Manuscript:	Finger Vein Recognition Using Geometric Properties
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		
Minor REVISION comments	The article is devoted to the identification of a person by the pattern of veins in a finger pattern. It has done a lot of practical work. The structure of paper is organized by analogy with the many works on this subject (for example, Asmaa Q. Shareef, Loay E. George, Roaa E. Fadel. Finger Vein Recognition Using Haar Wavelet Transform. IJCSMC, Vol. 4, Issue. 3, March 2015, pg.1 – 7). The difference is, the choice of the characteristic features for recognition. The sequence of the pretreatment steps in almost all work is repeated. To this article has following comments. You need to give an explanation for the formula (2). How varies the L? In the article have not been proposed new approaches to problem solving. The sequence of steps is collected from well-known methods and means. It does not described as forming the vector of the characteristic features. How pre-processing image is influencing on the result? In the article (Asmaa Q. Shareef, Loay E. George, Roaa E. Fadel. Finger Vein Recognition Using Haar Wavelet Transform. IJCSMC, Vol. 4, Issue. 3, March 2015, pg.1 – 7) obtained a result of 99.89%, which is 0.6% better than suggested by you. It is necessary to give a comparison with the known methods. You also need to describe the size of the learning	- This paper is an extension for the paper mentioned in your comment (i.e., published in IJCSMC). - L in formula (2) is the number of possible intensity values, which is 256. - We would like to clarify that a new method in thinning step is introduced. Two levels of thinning (coarse thinning plus Zhang-Suen algorithm). - In feature extraction stage we had used the newly modified concept "low order geometrical norm^p" with p less than one. This modified concept was used recently in some texture images and proved to be efficient. The test results in our paper proved that this feature concept is fruitful to get high recognition results. - Figure (9) was added to illustrate the way of forming the feature vector. - In the article of Asmaa Q. Shareef, Loay E. George, Roaa E. Fadel the used data set was consisted 636 samples, while in this work the number of used samples in this paper was 3,816 samples, for this reason a small degradation in recognition rate was occurred. - Every image is of gray scale type, and stored in "bmp" format with 320×240 pixels in size.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	sample and the test set, which gave such good results.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		