ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: **14.09.2017**	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: **19.09.2017**
Manuscript Title: **IMAGE PROCESSING OF MOTION FOR SECURITY APPLICATIONS**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **09132/17**	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
No comments	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
There is no change needed in abstract. It presents clearly the content of the paper and the main conclusions.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
I did not find typos and grammar errors within the text of the article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The authors clearly presented the distinctive steps in the study method description. This part of the paper does not require the changes.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**

The table captions should be placed above the tables.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
Yes, but conclusions will be easier to read when they will be presented in the form of points.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
No suggestions	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	**X**
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is of a very good quality and presents very interesting topic. I have only two small suggestions:
- please place the table captions above the tables,
- please present the conclusion section in the form of points.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper is well-prepared, so my recommendation is to accept the paper in current form. The subsequent sections demonstrate the steps of the research and explain approach and the results obtained. I would like to point out that I have no doubts in the field of quality assessment of the paper.