SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_44274**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Optimization of Point-Set Matching Model for Robust Fingerprint Verification in Changing Weather Conditions**
Type of the Article	**Short 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:

(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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	This study provides a baseline for the configuration of Automated Fingerprint Verification System (AFVS) in the face of changing weather and environmental conditions. Following are comments and suggestions: 1. Add structure of paper at the last paragraph of Introduction section. 2. Literature review is not sufficient. If possible, assign separate section for Literature Review and elaborate relevant studies. 3. The data are too limited. The authors should update more data to explore quality of research. 4. Results and Discussion section is too short. There is no justification of results which should be updated with relevant citations. 5. Limitations and future recommendation of the study should be added. 6. The new studies (citations) of recent five years research should be included in the paper. 7. The study lacks significant practical contributions.	The comments and suggestions on 1, 2 and 6 have been noted and corrected in line with the reviewer's comments as highlighted in the manuscript. However, the study is limited to data set of only a certain region and if updated will alter the coefficients of the linear constraints that are already used in the entire experiment. Other comments in 3, 5, 6 and 7 have been noted and modified as highlighted in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* No significant ethical issues	It is agreed that the manuscript has no significant ethical issues