

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_105995
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF MACHINE LEARNING ALGORITHMS USING COMBINED FEATURE EXTRACTION TECHNIQUES FOR SPEAKER IDENTIFICATION
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>My suggestions is major revision. Please send review certificate</p> <p>This research paper explores an intriguing topic by evaluating machine learning algorithms for speaker identification using combined feature extraction techniques. A major revision is needed to clarify the methodology and results further.</p> <p>The paper lacks a clear explanation of the combined feature extraction techniques employed. A major revision should focus on providing a comprehensive understanding of these techniques.</p> <p>The results section needs significant improvement to present the findings more concisely and with a clear emphasis on the impact of the combined feature extraction techniques.</p> <p>The paper's abstract should be rewritten to provide a better overview of the research objectives and key findings, as it currently lacks clarity.</p> <p>There is a need for more detailed information on the dataset used in the study and how it was preprocessed. A major revision should include this information for better reproducibility.</p> <p>The paper could benefit from a more comprehensive literature review, highlighting existing studies in the field and how this research contributes to the existing knowledge.</p> <p>The methodology section should be restructured for better clarity and organization. It should clearly outline the steps followed in the evaluation of machine learning algorithms.</p> <p>The paper should include a discussion section where the results are analyzed in-depth, and the implications of the findings are explored. Currently, this section is lacking.</p> <p>Figures and tables should be revised for clarity and labeled appropriately to enhance the reader's understanding.</p> <p>Proofreading is essential to correct grammar and spelling errors throughout the paper, as there are several issues.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	AnuragSinha
Department, University & Country	Amity University, India