SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMCS_57935**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Fast and Effective Region-based Depth Map Upsampling with Application to Location Map-Free Reversible Data Hiding**
Type of the Article	**Type of 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)

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	**1. On what basis you are partitioning the pixels into 3 categories?** **2. 0.052,0.069,0.074 Justify these values.** **3. Why you are using ballons video sequence?** **4. Are you creating any database in c++ for storing depth copying values?** **5. Fig 2: source frame sie is too small than comparison frames; resolution of figure (e) seems non-coinciding with Fig [b,c,d]** **6. How 1.634 is possible with JUR as BC+MV+BI itself is giving 0.88; justify** **7. The usage of histogram shifting deviates the concept form your work proposal. In the initial level itself, usage of histogram shifting will override depth copying pixel then, what is the need of the first proposal?** **8. Only JUR will not give E – capacity as 55.60 50.77 48.56 47.04 JUR + Histogram shifting is required: Justification required** **9. How you are telling that your work is fast and efficient: showcase with evidence** **10. Fig 4 data missing [E-capacity vs PSNR]**	***Compulsory comment 1:*** On what basis you are partitioning the pixels into 3 categories? ***Response:*** As explained in the first paragraph of Section 3 on pages 7-8, we describe the reason why we are partitioning the pixels into 3 categories. ***Compulsory comment 2:*** 0.052, 0.069, 0.074 Justify these values. ***Response:*** In Table 2, the term ``Execution-time'' has been changed to ``Execution-time (seconds)''. As described in Subsection 5.1.3, the execution time comparison among the considered methods is given. ***Compulsory comment 3:*** Why you are using ballons video sequence? ***Response:*** The typical and well-known dataset `` Mobile3DTV'', which includes the `` Ballons'' video sequence, has been used in our experiments. ***Compulsory comment 4:*** Are you creating any database in c++ for storing depth copying values? ***Response:*** As explained in the first paragraph of Subsection 3.1 on page 8, we describe how to construct homogeneous missing depth pixels by the depth copying approach. On the other hand, we don't store depth copying values. ***Compulsory comment 5:*** Fig 2: source frame size is too small than comparison frames; resolution of figure (e) seems non-coinciding with Fig [b,c,d] ***Response:*** In fact, the resolution of each figure in Figs. 2(b)-(e) is 1024x768. For ease of visualization, Fig. 2 has been redrawn such that Figs. 2(d)-(e) have been placed at same row. ***Compulsory comment 6:*** How 1.634 is possible with JUR as BC+MV+BI itself is giving 0.88; justify ***Response:*** The combination `` BC+MV+BI-MD-RDH'' can embed 0.882 bpp, while our JUR (joint upsampling and location map-free reversible data hiding) combination can embed 1.634 bpp. ***Compulsory comment 7:*** The usage of histogram shifting deviates the concept from your work proposal. In the initial level itself, usage of histogram shifting will override depth copying pixel then, what is the need of the first proposal? ***Response:*** According to your comment, one new statement is added and the new statement is shown below.

		(see the end of Subsection 5.2.1 on page 16) ``Since the histogram shifting method is also a RDH method, the marked depth map by performing our JUR method can be correctly recovered from the marked map by performing the ``JUR + Histogram Shifting'' method; therefore, the problem of overriding depth copying pixels will not happen.'' ***Compulsory comment 8:*** Only JUR will not give E – capacity as 55.60 50.77 48.56 47.04 JUR + Histogram shifting is required: Justification required. ***Response:*** As described in Section 4 on pages 10-12, our JUR method joins upsampling and the data hiding. In Table 5, the four E–capacity values, namely 55.60, 50.77, 48.56, and 47.04, denote the four embedding capacities by using our JUR method (without including histogram shifting) when setting the bpp values to 0.1, 0.1, 0.5, and 0.7, respectively. ***Compulsory comment 9:*** How you are telling that your work is fast and efficient: showcase with evidence ***Response:*** Table 2, Table 3, Table 5, Fig. 3, and Fig. 4 have demonstrated the execution-time, quality, and embedding capacity merits of our ``DC+MV+BI'' and ``JUR'' methods. ***Compulsory comment 10:*** Fig 4 data missing [E-capacity vs PSNR] ***Response:*** According to your suggestion, the caption of Fig. 4 has been changed to `` The PSNR vs. E-capacity tradeoff comparison among the considered combinations.''.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	If the work has evidence and proper support data then it seems awesome	

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)*	