

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_101284
Title of the Manuscript:	REAL-TIME OBJECT DETECTION USING DEEP LEARNING
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. Yes. 2. Yes. 3. No. 4. No. 5. No. 6. Yes. Additional Comments: The authors have done a commendable job in outlining their methodology and presenting the results. However, some areas need significant improvements before it can be published.</p> <p>More Detailed Literature Review: A more in-depth literature review should be included. There's a brief mention of other object detection methods, but the discussion is superficial and doesn't provide enough information for a reader unfamiliar with the topic. The authors should also discuss the limitations of existing methods and why they've chosen to work with SSD.</p> <p>Clarification on Methodology: There's a need for more clarity in the Methodology section. The explanation of how the SSD works and how the authors have improved it needs to be presented more comprehensively. There should be a clear explanation of why SSD is suitable for the problem in hand and how it compares with other techniques.</p> <p>Experimental Section: The Experimental Section lacks detail about how the experiments were conducted. Information about how the data was collected and processed before being inputted to the SSD algorithm/model is missing. Additionally, it would be beneficial to include a description of the computational resources used to run these experiments.</p> <p>Results and Analysis: The Results and Analysis section is not presented clearly. The discussion on testing types seems out of context and doesn't contribute to understanding the performance of the proposed method. A more structured presentation of results and comparisons with other methods in terms of speed and accuracy would make this section more effective.</p> <p>Evaluation Metrics: The paper does not discuss what evaluation metrics are being used to assess the performance of the proposed method. Metrics such as precision, recall, and F1-score are standard in object detection tasks and should be included.</p> <p>Conclusion and Future Scope: The Conclusion section should include a summary of the paper's contributions and findings. The authors should also clearly state the limitations of their proposed method and outline potential future work in a more detailed manner.</p> <p>Overall, the paper holds promise, but these major revisions are necessary to improve its clarity, completeness, and robustness. It is recommended that the authors carefully address these comments in the revised version of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Must be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Xingsi Xue
Department, University & Country	School of Computer Science and Mathematics, Fujian University of Technology, China