



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_45729
Title of the Manuscript:	A Fuzzy Method For Meaningful Perspective on Visual Arts
Type of the Article	method

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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The paper attempts to describe the application of the formalism of fuzzy geometry to different kinds of perspective and their effect on the artistic impression of paintings along History of Arts. The idea is interesting and original, but to this reviewer the paper completely fails to provide any other things than vague concepts. The authors try to describe a kind of method for different perspective types, but as for the crucial points they refer to previous work by themselves, which renders the paper not self-contained. Too much space is devoted to the «discovering» of perspective by the Renaissance painters, which could have been used to introduce the basics of «meaningful points», «meaningful function», fuzzyfication, etc. The consequence is that the paper is hard to follow. Moreover, in my opinion it does not elaborate enough on the perspective distortions that appeared in later artistic currents, mainly during the twentieth century, how e.g. Expressionism exploited such distortions to create specific moods in the viewer (like suggesting oppressive feelings by an architecture in skyscraper's perspective, to name an example). By not explicitly describing what meaningful points are, where the shapes associated to them (triangles, squares, and at the end even hexagons) come from, what the fuzzyfication and defuzzyfication processes consist in, also the correspondences to pretended artistic effects are completely missed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>As for the writing, there are lots of incorrect constructions of sentences, verbosity, redundancies, and even typos. I sincerely encourage the authors to let the paper to be corrected by a native English speaker or a professional translator/corrector. It is a pity that potentially interesting facts explained get lost in this way, that contents blurr or fade due to formal issues. Just some of the issues found in the first four pages:</p> <p>«Perspective is a science by which we showing the distance and proximity of objects» → show. More than a «science», I would speak about a «representation technique». Distance and proximity are in fact kind of synonyms, so this phrasing is a little bit redundant. Rather, it is about representing a three dimensional world on a planar surface, which implicitly stresses the relative distance of the objects to the viewer.</p> <p>«the difference between the eyes and the camera is that the eye continuously captures images of the object in continuous moments of time» → redundant, «continuously» already means «in continuous moments of time».</p> <p>« But this kind of painting... reality of objects cannot be fully perceived.» What is actually claimed here is that reality is multifaceted, and that the physical and psychological circumstances of the human viewer (or the artist) condition its representation in the sense that only certain aspects are depicted, right? Then, as it is said next, I would not speak about «false reality» of the subject, this value judgement is out of place here. I would rather insist on the partiality of the representation, i.e., that it allows to depict only part of the subject. This does not necessarily mean that it is «false».</p> <p>If you use capital letter for Holy Mary, etc. then maybe you should also use it for «Trinity».</p> <p>«The work that created the illusion in them that a hole was created in the wall, though» → «The work created the illusion of a hole in the wall, through»</p> <p>« the statue-like state» → ???</p> <p>« If we leave the Masaccio, and we have» → «If we leave Masaccio, we have»</p>	<p>Thanks for your feedback. The text has been re-edited and necessary changes have been made.</p> <p>It should be emphasized that this article is a method in line with the goals of the previous articles. And from the outset, my purpose of designing these articles was to separately present the discussion of geometric principles, so in this article, the reader interested in art and fuzzy thinking can refer to previous articles during implementation. Discussing implementation details merely adds an unnecessary amount to the volume of the paper, from which the author avoids.</p> <p>My purpose of referring to the fifteenth century was to precisely study the roots of the emergence of geometric perspective, and as already mentioned, even before the modernization period, there were painters who challenged the rules of perspective, which in the 20th century caused the geometric perspective have an intangible effect on the painting works, and the perspective of color found a strong presence. Therefore, in this article it seemed unnecessary to repeat the issue of modern art about the geometric perspective in the twentieth century. In response to the existing challenges, this paper seeks to revive perspective geometric principles with a look based on the roots of modern art thinking, i.e. individualism and subjective independence of the artist. Because the author, like some art historians, believes that in contemporary art, we will return to the art before the twentieth century, but it has been obtained with the acquisitions and perceptions of modern art and technology of the current century.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>«enunciation of the birth» → «Annunciation»</p> <p>«But his sole aim, such as Simone Martini, has been the most beautiful» → «His sole aim, like in the case of Simone Martini, has been a more beautiful»</p> <p>«Notice that there is no so much mobility» → «Notice that the figures are rather static»</p> <p>«less induction» → ???</p> <p>« it seems that his work has been amazing in his own way» → Either the work is amazing or not, but it cannot seem to have been amazing...</p> <p>« the perspective made such an excitement in Uccello» → « the perspective excited Uccello so much»</p> <p>« his greatest honor» → « his greatest achievement»</p> <p>« Such a figure was not painted before that, and» → « Such a figure had not been painted ever before, and»</p> <p>« the works shown in Fig5» → « the work shown in Fig. 5»</p> <p>«But in the fifteenth century, the most prominent works in the use of perspective technique, after Masaccio, and in the second half of the fifteenth century, can be attributed to the works of artists such as Piero della Francesca (in Constantine's Sleep work in Fig6) that was created around 1460.» → «In the fifteenth century, and more specifically in the second half, the most prominent works in the use of perspective are the paintings of artists such as Piero della Francesca, like in Constantine's Sleep, around 1460 (see Fig. 6).»</p> <p>« which was important as» → « which was as important as»</p> <p>«As it can be said that nobody found the modern facilities of playing with light like Francesca.» → «It can be said that nobody was able to play with light as did della Francesca.»</p> <p>Mantegna → Mantegna, Albert Durer → Albrecht Dürer</p> <p>And so on...</p> <p>Fig. 12, 13, 16... is clearly not a cube but a parallelogram.</p> <p>As said above, although the issue has been treated in their previous papers, the meaning of «meaningful perspective», «meaningful line», and «meaningful function» should be briefly stated, for the paper to be self-contained. For example, the sentence «the points A'B'C' in the triangular meaningful vanishing point» is not clear, it is not a formally rigorous statement, and it can only be guessed that such points are on the vertical plane containing the horizon line... All the following discussion, e.g. in Section «2. Two-point meaningful perspective» of meaningful vanishing points with a shape (!) is meaningless without this previous explanation. Questions arise like why a triangle on one side and a square on the other, or why are they rotated and how the rotation angle is decided, etc.</p> <p>Step 2 of Section 4. Meaningful three-point perspective makes no sense to me. It is clearly followed to determine the location of the roof (not the ceiling, which is inside!) top, but I cannot see any relation to «the base of the third vanishing point». I don't see the third vanishing point (the upper triangle, right?) anywhere along a vertical line in Fig. 23, as</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>«explained» in Step 3.</p> <p>The meaning of the fuzzification and defuzzification steps appear quite obscure to me. Again, a brief explanation, in this case of fuzzy geometry rules, should be provided to make the paper understandable. It appears quite shocking to me that a paper sent to a mathematical journal not only provides no formula or algorithm, but not even a formally described method.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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