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	

	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.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer