

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_79426
Title of the Manuscript:	Brain Tumor Classification using Machine Learning
Type of the 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-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 there is a lot of confusion. In the Literature Review are cited many papers on the topic with many details that cannot be understand by expert in medicine, on the other hand the same details are not intriguing to an expert in machine learning since already known. Although, the flow chart of the work could sound interesting, it lacks of many information, we do not want to know what library you have used, the reader would like to know details on the choices you have done and the motivations for that. Part of the confusion I observe is probably due to poor English, I suggest using a native speaker to make the paper clearer.</p> <p>Here are listed some of my remarks:</p> <p>In the Abstract I suggest to delete "two principal components of data"</p> <p>In the Aims section please rephrase "Also, it is about the smart predictions for the upcoming tumor patients using Machine Learning.", please use an English native speaker</p> <p>In the Study design please rephrase "analyzing" with analysis</p> <p>In the Introduction please rephrase "second prime reason".</p> <p>In the Introduction please rephrase " and Detection of Brain Tumor a detection and classifi ation"</p> <p>In the Introduction "Implementation of correct classification algorithm on data lead " correct the typo "leads"</p> <p>In the Literature Review please Define the acronym SAM, SVM, AANLIB, CNN etc..</p> <p>In the Literature Review pelase rephrase "Since KNN builds up a confirmed classifier inside the non-stationary info stream setting. ", it is not clear what ypu mean</p> <p>In the Literature Review please correct the typo "Haarlick", it is Haralick</p> <p>The literature review is not useful for expert in machine learning (they know all these techniques and many details are not useful) and for expert in medicine (e.g. they do not know why random forest can be used and what is keras): please keep in mind who you direct the work, and focus on this.</p> <p>Sec. 3 "is about finding hidden layer" are you referring to neural networks? please explain</p> <p>Sec. 3 define the acronym DL</p> <p>Src. 3 "Tools for implementation for reading and operation data are NumPy, pandas. The structure of data frame is for classification of tumor into two classes with dependency of 9 parameters. For visualization, matplotlib, seaborn and plotly is implemented. Plotly Dash is made for visualizing 3D plot. Sci-kit learn tools are used for building ML models", it is not useful neither for expert in machine learning nor in medicine.</p> <p>Sec. 3 "The Tumor dataset has 699 rows and 11 columns " are they images from MRI? please explain</p> <p>Sec. 3 "Class 2 and 4 are two unique values for classification of Tumor" pelase explain what you mean</p> <p>Sec. 3 "Value of K is determined by taking square root of the size of data which is 21 (for this data)" pleas explain why this choice, in case add a reference if you have chosen according to other previous works</p> <p>Sec. 3 "Tuning this K value (hyper parameters)", please explain why hyper paramters are plural?</p> <p>Sec. 3 please correct the typo "Plotly"</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ilaria Cacciari
Department, University & Country	IFAC-CNR, Italy