



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_50591
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing PIGPEN Image Steganography Method by using Zigzag scanning
Type of the 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	<p>1. Relative to ref.[9], this report only adds zigzag scanning and is not innovative enough.</p> <p>2. " Hiding data using ZIGZAG scanning is more efficient than the sequential embedding", why?</p> <p>3. Compared to general scrambling algorithms (such as cellular automata, chaos-based scrambling algorithms), ZIGZAG scanning does not improve security.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>4. This report is a further study of ref. [9], so it is best to add a comparison experiment with [9].</p> <p>5. What is the robustness of the algorithm?</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



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<i>manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Gang-Qiang Xiong</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Guangdong Medical University, China</i>