

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_95283
Title of the Manuscript:	A Deep Learning Approach to Classify the Potato Leaf Disease
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.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (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. This paper tests the use of convolutional neural network for potato disease classification.</p> <p>2. The title is good.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure is appropriate.</p> <p>5. The author did not clarify if the testing images were included withing the training data. If they were, then the approach is not correct and will explain the suspicious 100% accuracy. The testing data should have been taking out of the dataset before the training process. Otherwise, the approach would be correct.</p> <p>6. The references related to deep leaning are mostly old (mostly 2014 and earlier, with one in 2021 and others in 2019 and 2018) it would be great if the author could add more recent references.</p> <p>7. The images are divided into three classes Early Blight, Late Blight, and Healthy. The author should add another class for other diseases (if this was taken under consideration it should be mentioned in the paper).</p> <p>8. The author should mention the average training and testing time.</p> <p>9. He also should specify the machine used (the processor, the OS and the GPU if one was used).</p> <p>10. He should include a comparative study with other techniques in the literature.</p> <p>11. Adding a figure explaining in details the model would greatly be appreciated by the readers.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The manuscript needs extensive revision for language and grammar.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Figures from 5 to 7 are unnecessary.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hachchane Imane
Department, University & Country	University Hassan II, Morocco