



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCOS_47947</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF FEATURE EXTRACTION TECHNIQUES IN MULTI-LAYER BASED FINGERPRINT ETHNICITY RECOGNITION SYSTEM</b>
Type of the Article	<b><u>Original Research Article</u></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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Paper is very well written and laid out. This is a scientific paper that contributes to finger print recognition evaluation of feature extraction techniques. The writing style is very clear and the authors have considered previous works and have properly understood them.</b></p> <p><b>The abstract is longer than the introduction! This should be the other way round! The abstract can be shortened and the material removed can be placed in the introduction to lengthen it.</b></p> <p><b>Some more references can be added to this work. 15 references are a bit too few. Kindly add more references</b></p> <p><b>The conclusion is good however it is too short for all the work the authors have done. It is suggested to lengthen this part and summarise their findings and possible future challenges in this area.</b></p> <p><b>The results of the performance evaluation section are too statistical (i.e. they are very good but have not been fully interpreted or explained! ). It is suggested that the authors give a concrete and good interpretation of their statistical analysis. i.e. e.g. as an example: what are the conclusions derived from the t- test in practice? How would these affect or impact?</b>  <b>Again the authors talk about statistical significance. Can the interpretation of this statistical significance be stated. I.e. they need to explain what this really means in the real world or how it would impact.</b></p> <p><b>Fig. 1 needs to be resized. Parts of it are too small to read properly.</b></p> <p><b>"In view of the above computation time analysis, KLDA is more computationally expensive than KPCA in terms of processing speed in ethnicity fingerprint recognition system" Can</b></p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>the authors explain a bit more clearly why KLDA is more computationally expensive. Under certain conditions might this possibly change? i.e. it is recommended to give more details please!!</p> <p>THESE ARE MINOR REVISION SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE PAPER and POSSIBLE FUTURE WORK.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anthony Spiteri Staines</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Malta, Malta</b>