

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_103535
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF A GENETIC ALGORITHM BASED GEODESIC ACTIVE CONTOUR FOR IRIS BASED ETHNICITY PREDICTION 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:

(<https://www.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
	<p>This paper is not formatted for review (you must have line numbers for reference, since you did not include line numbers you will need to find where the comments are referenced)</p> <p>Overall, a nice paper. The author should address the comments.</p> <p>Introduction do not explain what iris is (you should have a sentence or two what is it and why it is important, why you are doing this work?)</p> <p>Please look at General Guideline for Authors (peerreviewcentral.com) And follow references style. Make sure you are following the journal requirements</p> <p>Page numbers ? missing</p> <p>Page 2? Paragraph 3 line #? - Explain what are the odds to have duplicate in iris compare to others. Since you mention they are accurate you need to compare against figure prints and others. An estimated number give the read better understanding.</p> <p>Page 3+ has grammar mistakes, need to be fixed</p> <p>You mention parameter C without reference. You should explain the paraments first and then reference them. If you explain it later, you should provide reference to that image or formula.</p> <p>Please rewrite or clarify better False positive rate</p> <p>Redefine Sensitivity and specificity... probability is incorrect term</p> <p>Redefine accuracy in statistis. (all of the above must be fixed. Must have clear definitions)</p> <p>Fix formatting on the page</p> <p>Need a reference of comparison for - The use of evolutionary algorithm for speed should be provided (on average x times faster for those problems/challenges given by ... reference.</p> <p>Section 3</p> <p>Image resolution and color is not mentioned from the different datasets. The author should explain if that influence the results.</p> <p>3.3.2 code should be formatted with the right indents. Looks like an END is missing</p> <p>Formatting need to be fixed (where is step 3?)</p> <p>for matting for phase 3, 4 must be fixed</p> <p>C paraments and Y parameter are nor referred to a formula</p> <p>3.3. fix formatting</p> <p>Images are unclear, see if you can correct figures 5, 6, 7</p> <p>Figure 9 Should be subgraphs one graph for each. The reader cannot avaluate FPR compare to the other graphs. . Y access does not make sense and vary from one graph to another.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	The author should explain what data was used for testing. It mentioned K fold was used, but the size is not mentioned. Moreover, test data should be totally separated from the K fold and the number of images, % of each set should be given to the reader, so it can be evaluated. Please provide more information to the reader.	
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript provide proof of concept to consider.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Author should address the last comment, generally yes</p> <p>6. Yes, references formatting should be fixed</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Generally, yes. Need to fix small mistakes	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ohad Bar Siman Tov
Department, University & Country	Binghamton University, USA