

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_69033
Title of the Manuscript:	Image Authentication Based on Watermarking Approach: Review
Type of the Article	Review 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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>In this paper, the authors present a review of Image Authentication based on Watermarking. The purpose of this review paper is to succinctly review recent progress in a field of image authentication and its applications. It summarizes the current state of knowledge and creates an understanding for the reader by discussing the findings proposed in recent research articles. I may recommend this article with following major revisions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors should definitely seek help from a native English speaker to remove grammatical mistakes for example the wrong use of singular and plural etc. 2. No mathematical expressions are given for DCT, DWT, SVD, and etc. 3. "Generate the vector(s) of the device using LBP then perform XOR with hidden watermark" page no. 7. Write mathematical equations and importance of these variables. 4. Give significance of "Fig. 6 DCT Frequency 8X8 block" 5. Wrong caption "Fig. 7 image by DWT". 6. Provide statistical analysis of "3.3. Image Watermarking Performances" 7. The overall review of each algorithm seems to be completed but it is advised to add more supporting references that will eventually increase the manuscript's value. 8. The discussion must provide more insights into why the algorithm indeed beats some others off and why in some cases, it only equals some algorithms. What are the reasons for this behaviour? 9. Finally, the conclusions must be expanded to discuss the implications of the algorithm's good performance in comparison to the other methods and also include future scope. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Simrandeep Singh
Department, University & Country	Chandigarh University, India