

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_126899
Title of the Manuscript:	Machine Learning and Deep Learning Approaches Based Rose Plant Leaf Disease Recognition
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the scientific community by addressing the application of machine learning and deep learning models for disease detection in rose plants, a subject with both agricultural and economic significance. The study offers insights into automated disease recognition, which can support more efficient and sustainable disease management practices, reducing losses for growers and enhancing crop quality. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on comparing multiple models (CNN, SVM, and KNN), as it provides a comprehensive view of potential approaches for similar tasks, adding practical relevance. However, the manuscript could be further strengthened with a more detailed explanation of methodology and clearer presentation of results, which would increase its impact and accessibility to a broader audience.	Ok I will write the sentences.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, " Machine Learning and Deep Learning Approaches Based Rose Plant Leaf Disease Recognition ," is informative but could be slightly refined for clarity and readability. Here's a suggested alternative: Deep Learning and Machine Learning Approaches for Automated Disease Detection in Rose Plant Leaves	I already changed title.
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 provides a general overview of the research but could be enhanced for comprehensiveness. To improve its effectiveness, it would benefit from highlighting the purpose and novelty of the study, explaining why this work is unique or valuable within the context of existing research. The abstract should also include a more detailed description of the methodology, specifying why CNN, SVM, and KNN were chosen for image classification and how they were applied in the study. Additionally, incorporating key results, particularly the accuracy rates achieved by each model, would provide readers with a quick understanding of which model performed best. A brief mention of the real-world implications, such as potential deployment in agricultural monitoring systems or integration into mobile applications, would add practical relevance. Finally, refining the language for conciseness could make the abstract clearer and more engaging. These adjustments would result in a more informative and compelling summary of the study and its outcomes.	I changed abstract slightly based on review comments.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure and subsections are generally appropriate, covering essential sections such as the introduction, literature review, methodology, results, and conclusion.	I will add two extra sections but I will remove these and follow the reviewer comments.
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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by employing well-established machine learning models (CNN, SVM, and KNN) for the task of plant disease recognition, a field where these methods are widely validated. The authors have used a comprehensive dataset, encompassing various rose leaf diseases, which helps ensure the robustness of their findings and provides valuable data diversity for model training and testing. The methodological approach, including data pre-processing, feature extraction, and model evaluation, follows standard practices in machine learning, suggesting that the study's technical foundation is sound. However, further details on dataset characteristics and hyperparameter tuning could strengthen the scientific rigor and reproducibility of the study.	This work implemented in future research.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The manuscript includes a selection of references pertinent to plant disease detection using machine learning and deep learning techniques. However, several references are over a decade old, and the field has seen significant advancements in recent years. To enhance the manuscript's relevance and depth, incorporating more recent studies is advisable.	Few old references are removed.

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally adequate for scholarly communication, but there are areas where clarity and conciseness could be improved. The manuscript uses technical terminology appropriately, but some sentences could benefit from restructuring to enhance readability and flow. Minor grammatical issues and typographical inconsistencies were noted, especially in section headings and figure captions, which could be standardized to improve presentation. With careful editing for sentence structure, grammar, and formatting, the article's language quality would be fully suitable for scholarly communication.	Slightly some sentences are modified.
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No