



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> 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?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. line 34, "[1].Nowadays," -> "[1]. Nowadays," 2. All equations 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"	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Suzhou institute of biomedical engineering and technology, China