

Review Form2

Book Name:	Science and Technology - Recent Updates and Future Prospects
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2188
Title of the Manuscript:	Texture Segmentation Approach Based on Entropy Based Local Binary Pattern Operator
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it presents an innovative approach to unsupervised texture segmentation, a key area in image analysis. By leveraging entropy-based Local Binary Pattern (LBP) operators alongside Fuzzy-c-Means (FCM) and K-Means clustering, the study offers a more efficient method for extracting and analyzing textural information. I appreciate the manuscript for its comprehensive methodology and the potential it has to improve texture segmentation accuracy, which is crucial for various applications in computer vision. However, the paper could benefit from a more detailed comparison with existing techniques to further highlight its advantages.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is fairly comprehensive, outlining the key elements of the proposed approach for unsupervised texture segmentation. It effectively covers the method's main components—entropy-based Local Binary Pattern (LBP), Fuzzy-c-Means (FCM), K-Means clustering, and the testing process.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust, presenting a well-defined problem in texture segmentation and classification. It integrates entropy-based Local Binary Pattern (LBP) with Fuzzy-C-Means (FCM) and K-Means clustering. Experimental validation using the Brodatz image database, along with comparative analysis, further supports the effectiveness and relevance of the method.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	** Literature review only includes references up to 2015, missing recent advancements in the field. Updating the literature review with more recent studies would strengthen the manuscript and ensure its relevance in the current scientific landscape. The manuscript mentions citations from 2004 (e.g., Ojala and Pietikäinen, 2004), (Al-Hamdan, 2004), (A. German, M. R. Jenkin, and Y. Lesp´erance, 2005)..... that are not present in the references section. This discrepancy needs to be addressed.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is quite dated and could benefit from revision to reflect more current advancements in the field. Updating the references and incorporating recent research will enhance its relevance and accuracy.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vaishali S. Pawar
Department, University & Country	MVP S’s KBT College of Engineering, India