

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_87940
Title of the Manuscript:	Deep Neural Network approach based Segmentation, Detection, and Classification of Brain Tumor
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>In Preprocessing, the proposed method uses median filtering to remove the noise. Along with the noise, median filter will remove the high frequency edge details also which is important in medical image processing. Authors are asked to give the justification in the paper itself. Also in the introduction part of pre-processing, it was mentioned that medium filtering, it should be median filtering. It was mentioned that</b> "Due to the huge number of images usually obtained during medical imaging [21], medical specialists can't classify the acquired images in a reasonable time manually." But the purpose of segmentation is different.	Thank you very much for your professional comments; we have corrected it as you suggested. <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The impulse noise is reduced using a median filter with a 3 × 3 kernel. The enhanced image quality was significantly improved. On the other hand, the enhanced image looked smoothed, reducing the high-frequency information. As a result, a lower kernel size is recommended for median filtering to avoid losing useful information and edges.</li><li>2. We have corrected the spelling mistake as you suggested.</li><li>3. As you suggested, we have modified it: "The main objective of segmentation is to simplify objects and turn medical information into a useful subject. The segmentation outcomes impact subsequent image analysis operations such as feature measurement, object representation and description, and even higher-level tasks like object classification".</li></ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	In the experimental section, please specify the name of the features extracted for classification. In future extraction algorithm, please specify the name of dwt used. Please include the web page of two data sets in the reference.	Thank you very much for your professional comments; we have corrected it as you suggested. All the changes are highlighted in the revised version. <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The categorization of the extracted features is achieved using the Support Vector Machine terminology. Recall, precision, accuracy, and f-measure are calculated and analyzed here.</li><li>2. Discrete Wavelet Transform (DWT).</li><li>3. As you suggested, we have added the web page of two data sets in the references.</li></ol>
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	