



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_49994
Title of the Manuscript:	An Accurate System for Face Detection and Recognition
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:

(<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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Authentication is an important issue in system control in computer-based communication. Human face recognition is a significant branch of biometric verification and has been used widely in many applications, such as video monitor system, human-computer interaction, and door control system and network security. In this paper we are concerned with faces on a video stream so we built a modified face recognition technique based on Local Binary Pattern histogram with processed data (faces detected before by using a combination of Haar cascade files that uses skin detection, eye detection and nose detection) as input of LBP to increase the accuracy of the proposed recognition system. The modified LBPH method improved the success rate to 96.5 % with error rate 3.5%, while using Eigenface only has a high error rate 29% and only 70 % recognition rate. Also using LBPH has approximate 84% of recognition rate and 15 % error rate. The success rate of the proposed recognition system was better than the Eigenfaces and LBPH only techniques.</p> <p>In my opinion, the paper is well written and organized. The work of the paper is correct. However, there are some comments to improve the quality of the paper which are given as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the introduction part, the author should give more background works in details about advantages of the proposed method over the existing methods • Some remarks on the computation complexity of the obtained results should be given. 	<p>Thanks</p> <p>I try to take these notes in my consideration. Done</p>
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>	