

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science                           |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJRCOS_95285   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Human Regular Activities Recognition using Convolutional Neural Network |
| 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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/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) |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?<br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>1. Yes, the scientific community will benefit from the study.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. The numbering of the sections needs to be revised.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct but the methodology process requires a detailed systematic approach.</p> <p>6. The references are okay but adding more current references in the introduction and literature review sections will improve the paper.</p> <p>Suggestions/Comments</p> <p>7. The problem that motivated the research is not clear and should be clearly stated in the introduction. Why is the problem important and needed to be address and what is the status quo of related research in the field.</p> <p>8. Abbreviations should be firstly defined before using where necessary.</p> <p>9. The referencing of authors (example in [6], in [7], ....., in [15]) in section 2 should be revised. Example: Bashar et al. [6] developed....., Bouvrie [5] proposed.....</p> <p>10. The gaps in the related works should be established. Why gaps this study is addressing and why CNN is the appropriate model for the research.</p> <p>11. The method of the research should be well presented. Include a systematic step describing the overall process.</p> <p>12. For model evaluation, examine the number of epochs of each model for at least 5-10 sets in order to assess the general performance limits of the models.</p> <p>13. The axes of ResNet50 model of figure 10 should be labeled and the entire graph should be briefly discussed.</p> <p>14. There is no outcome showing the prediction/classification of classes (exercise, gardening and farming, home activities, occupation and sport).</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>  | <p>1. The English writing and grammar should be revised. Authors are suggested to send this manuscript for English editing or use English editing software such as Grammarly.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>Generally, the paper is good but requires major revision.</p>   |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Abdul Karim Armah</b>   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>School of Management Engineering, Zhengzhou University, Ghana</b> |