

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	Regular paper

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, HAR is the most important field nowadays, it can be used in various area such as healthcare section to monitor elderly people, In security and safety sector such as surveillance Yes, it is acceptable. Yes Yes, the authors success to organize the paper sections in readable manner Yes, but only one concern which is the outcomes of the proposed methods needs to improve just 91% as accuracy rate is inefficient. There are many papers have an accuracy more than 96%. The authors should to improve their results. No, many papers the authors not cited in the manuscript https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6427144/	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to proofreading,	
Optional/General comments	Not encouraging results, and the proposed method need to improve by doing additional experiments on other dataset	

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ashwan A. Abdulmunem
Department, University & Country	University of Kerbala, Iraq