



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMCS_45909</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Automatic Detection of Edges in Handmade Embroidery Patterns</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>JUST CORRECT THE LAYOUT OF THIS PAPER AND FIGURE 2, and 3 (page 6). THESE ARE NOT SO NEAT AND CAN BE IMPROVED</b></p> <p><b>Page 3 '... better performance' the sentence is not aligned. Kindly correct this</b></p> <p><b>Page 4 properly align equation 1.5</b></p> <p><b>Page 6 figure 3 is not aligned also apart from the fact that it needs to be redrawn along with figure 5</b></p>	<p>Dear Reviewer,</p> <p>Thank you for your useful comments and suggestions. We have modified the manuscript accordingly, and detailed corrections are listed below point by point:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The sentence on 'page 3' has been aligned.</li> <li>2. The equation 1.5 on 'page 4' has been properly aligned.</li> <li>3. Figure 3 on 'page 6' has been redrawn and aligned along figure 5.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>This paper is very well written and the results are simple to interpret. I.e. it is clear from table 2 that the CED algorithm has generated the fastest approach under certain conditions. The writing style is very clear and well detailed and the paper provides enough evidence to repeat the experiment. The introduction, literature review, work done, experiment and conclusion seem to be very clear and well written and explained. There are a sufficient number of references. The paper indicates that the author/s have carried out a considerable amount of work and are conversant with the topic.</p> <p>Given the substantial amount of work in the paper the authors should now easily fix the minor issues in the compulsory revision comments.</p>	

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