



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
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	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. 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. 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. 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	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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 aforementioned paragraph. 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) - 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. -Figure 6: Captions need to be revised. - Figure 6: Figures can be smaller in size, the details will still be visible.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	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.) 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	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	L62: The authors gave a clear and comprehensive related work about the topic. I thank the authors for their meticulous work.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tayfun Kucukyilmaz
Department, University & Country	University of Turkish, Turkey