

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 1:56 PM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Fwd: Request for evaluation of revised paper, reference number 2013_OR_5877

This paper does not meet my standard of scientific writing. Going through the abstract alone uncovered three significant problems:

- 1) There is no *Cuckoo's algorithm* it is the Cuckoo Search (CS) algorithm. This is a major -altering the meaning- spelling mistake in the name of the algorithm they write about.
- 2) Names should start with a capital character (otsu's and kapur's method).
- 3) Work should be described in the past tense (mentioned in my first review).

The introduction does not build up a problem scenario. It starts by describing a technique which can be used for any type of image. However, this is not what I expect to read at the beginning of the introduction. To be clear, I want to know what is the problem and what is the proposed problem solution. Hence, all the points I stated under introduction in the reviewers reviewer's comment column were not addressed and indeed from the authors comments I can see that they were not understood.

Based on these points, I stick with my initial assessment:

4 Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered)

Reconsideration is possible, but I don't want to see the manuscript again, because the authors did not take into account the comments given in the first review.

Note: Anonymous Reviewer

Note: Modification was done in this email ONLY to hide the identity.