SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_64295**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Extracting a Bounded Region from a Map Using Flood Fill Algorithm**
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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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 paper proposes the extracting noise-free images from a bounded region with Map Using Flood Fill Algorithm, but the quality of this paper needs further improvement to be considered for publication. The detailed comments are listed as below: • The authors clearly presented the flow of the paper by organizing the content in proper way. • The concept/methodology proposed in this paper is straightforward, and seems didn't have much research value. • The problem on the extracting noise-free images have been receiving many discussion in recent years. What is the specialty of this paper raised by the authors? • The authors should highlight the research gap from the previous study. Some comparison results are required. • The authors should present results by taking different inputs and they have to tell how much efficiency they achieved compared to previous studies.	Correction done
Minor REVISION comments	**The authors should present results by taking different inputs.**	okay
Optional/General comments	• In my opinion, the authors should pay little more attention about literature review. They have to explain more about novelty of this paper.	Okay

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)*	