



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_5877
Title of the Manuscript:	Cuckoo's Search Algorithm based Technique for Exudates Detection in Diabetic Retinopathy
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 paper presents the known Cuckoo's algorithm for the exudates detection in diabetic retinopathy using multi-level thresholding. This paper is very poorly presented (text and illustrations) and contribution is too trivial ("lack of novelty"). There are grammatical/technical errors found as well. (1) INTRODUCTION – The challenges/limitations of modern research, problem definition, and research questions are not properly highlighted. (2) REVIEW OF PRIOR WORK – The authors failed to summarize the key problems and major limitations found from the literature survey. The author should not include known Matlab code. It looks like a general report. (3) CUCKOO'S SEARCH – Where is the reference [42]? I cannot see any algorithm presented here and no mathematics included in this section. There is no flow diagram. Where is the novelty here? This section is very poor. (4) METHODOLOGY – The authors did not include step-by-step procedures and eventually, did not include the result (figure/image) obtained from each step. There is no flow diagram, algorithm, or mathematics involved to support author's new contribution. The authors described only Matlab function. Where is the	Necessary changes in the text has been incorporated in the text. Introduction section has been amended. Review of prior work has been cited in section-2. Correct reference has been incorporated while explaining the cuckoo search. Suitable algorithm have been incorporated in section-4 of this manuscript. Flow chart Fig. 4.1 & table 4.1 has been included which presents the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	novelty/originality here? (6) RESULTS AND ANALYSIS - The authors taken only 6 retinal images. The accuracy of segmentation obtained is 97.9% while those obtained from otsu's method and kapur's method are 96.3% and 3% respectively. For otsu's and kapur's methods, where are the references? Why Kapur's method accuracy is only 3% and why the authors considered this method for comparison then? Why otsu's method and kapur's method are taken into account? How sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy are calculated? Where is the golden image? There is no depth analysis. I am doubtful, how their method obtained 97.9% accuracy? (7) REFERENCES – Reference section are very poor. The authors should follow recent journals and of course, good SCI journals as references. (8) ABSTRACT – need to rewrite to make significant improvement.	originality of work. Otsu's and kapur's method references are [10], [15,][16]. These references shows that otsu method perform better than kapur's method. The calculation for sensitivity, specificity and accuracy have been incorporated in table 5.1 & table 5.2. References have been provided. The abstract have been improved.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		