



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>Physical Review & Research International</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_PRR1_4783
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Diurnal Changes on the Quality of Digital Images
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Section 2.1, is μ represents the average intensity value? Please provide the equation for it. 2. In equation (1), should the first condition is $\mu < 128$, rather than $\mu < 154$? 3. In Section 2.2, please provide the equation for σ. 4. In Section 2.2, based on equation (2), σ_n will never has value greater than 0.5. Does this means that a region will never has too much contrast? What does a negative σ_n value means? 5. In Section 2.3, in equation (3), does \otimes means convolution? What is operator \cdot means? As the value takes the root of a squared value, should the equation simply written as $s = h \otimes I$? 6. Is σ in equation (4) takes the same value as σ in Section 2.2? If not, better to use other symbol. 7. Are equations (1) to (5) derived by the authors? If not, please cite the references before each 	<p>1 It is considered as the mean and represents the contrast of the image</p> <p>2 Derived equation used from references</p> <p>(a) S. Erkanli, J. Li and E. Oguslu, "Fusion of Visual and Thermal Images using Genetic Algorithms", <i>Bio Inspired Computational Algorithms and their Applications</i>, pp. 187-212, www.intenchopen.com</p> <p>(b) Rahman Z., The Lectures Notes of Image Processing, <i>Old Dominion University</i>, 2009.</p> <p>3 Its the standard deviation</p> <p>4 It can have a value greater than 0.5 but in that case the region will have too much contrast. A negative value of it will make the image poorer.</p> <p>convolution mod cant take -ve value 6 both are the same 7 NO Zia Ur Rahman, "The lectures notes of Image processing, Old Dominion University, 2009" Though a little</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>equation.</p> <p>8. In Section 2.4, "When $Q > 0.55$, the quality is considered to be ???"</p> <p>9. In Section 2.4, if $0.5 < Q < 0.55$, is the quality is good, or poor?</p> <p>10. In Section 4, more detailed description on how the images are taken need to be further elaborate. For example, as the authors took four pictures at one time, are the authors use the same camera, or use four different cameras? Did the authors use the tripod? At every direction, how many pictures are taken at one time?</p> <p>11. In my opinion, the results should be presented by either in tabular form, or as plot. No need to provide both, in order to reduce redundancy. For example, keep Table 1, and remove Fig. 6. Alternatively, keep Fig. 6, and remove Table 1.</p> <p>12. Why the tables did not provide also the values of the normalized sharpness parameter?</p>	<p>modification was done by multiplying the middle factor by 0.4</p> <p>good</p> <p>poor</p> <p>10 The images were taken with a single camera, however a three legged stand was used for capturing the images. The camera was tightly attached to the stand so that image should be captured at the same angle. Only one camera was used and at one time in one direction only one image was taken.</p> <p>11. ok</p> <p>12. There was no need provide the sharpness value separately. And if its necessary we will provide the same .</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		