SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJMCS_19490**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Local Binary Pattern And Ant Colony Optimization Based Feature Dimensionality Reduction Technique For Face Recognition System**
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	**This is an interesting work that shows a great effort of the authors to address the problem of face recognition in practice. However, there are several points not clear in the paper that would need a major revision by the authors, as follows:** **- The authors argue in the abstract that several techniques by others are based on frontal face views. However, the current paper is based on frontal samples as well according to the databases used;** **- What does 'lack of directionality' of the DWT mean?** **- In the introduction, the authors mention a limitation of PCA that is well-known, but there are other recent approaches to PCA that overcome such restriction related to non-optimal features for classification, such as the paper from Thomaz and Giraldi on a new ranking method for PCA, in Image and Vision Computing journal (2010);** **- Sections 2.1 and 2.2 are long and, in my opinion, not necessary because describe well-known and common knowledge. In contrast, there is no detail about the application of ACO after LBP. Why such use is relevant? That is, the authors should explain the importance of combining both techniques in the context of face recognition and how the optimised feature subset of ACO has been calculated. Otherwise, others cannot replicate the experimental results carried out;** **- How the sampling for classification has been done? The procedure adopted seems biased and sensitive**	

	to the choice of training samples. The authors should adopt a cross-validation procedure to better evaluate the approach and compare such results with state-of-the-art techniques. Otherwise, it is very difficult to the reader to assess the effectiveness of the approach proposed.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**University Center of FEI, Brazil**