Review Form 1.7

JournalName:	**JournalofEngineeringResearchandReports**
ManuscriptNumber:	**Ms_JERR_115718**
TitleoftheManuscript:	**DIGITALIMAGEFORGERYDETECTIONUSINGDEEPLEARNING**
TypeoftheArticle	**OriginalResearchArticle**

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)*
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)**		
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/Generalcomments	Overall, I found the manuscript to be informative and well-structured. The authors have addressed an important issue in the era of digital imaging and have proposed a solution utilising advanceddeep learning techniques, particularly convolutional neural networks (CNNs). The methodology described is detailed and includes preprocessing steps, model training, and performance evaluationusingstandardmetrics. However,Ihavesomeconcernsandsuggestionsforimprovement: Replicability:Theauthorsdidnotmentiontheavailabilityofthecodeortrainedmodel,whichcouldhinderthereplicabilityoftheresearch.Irecommendthattheauthorsmaketheircodeandmodelpubliclyavailabletofacilitatereproducibilityandfurtherresearchinthefield. DiversityofDataset:Whilethemanuscriptmentionstheuseofalargedatasetfortrainingandevaluation,thereisalackofdetailregardingthediversityofimagesincludedinthedataset.Itwouldbebeneficialfortheauthorstoprovidemoreinformationontheselectioncriteriaanddiversityofimagestoassessthegeneralizationcapabilitiesoftheproposedmodel. ClarityandConciseness:Somesectionsofthemanuscriptappearrepetitive,suchasthedescriptionofperformancemetricsandtheliteraturereview.Isuggestthattheauthorsstreamlinethesesectionstoimproveclarityandconciseness. DiscussionofLimitations:Themanuscriptwouldbenefitfromadiscussionofpotentiallimitationsorchallengesencounteredduringthedevelopmentandimplementationoftheproposedsystem.Addressingtheselimitationswouldenhancethecredibilityandapplicabilityoftheresearch. PracticalImplementation:Whilethemanuscriptmentionsthepotentialforreal-timeimplementation,itlacksdetailsonthehardwareorsoftwarerequirementsforsuchimplementation.Additionally,thereisnodiscussiononthecomputationalefficiencyoftheproposedmodel.Providingthisinformationwouldenhancethepracticalutilityoftheresearch. Inconclusion,whilethemanuscriptpresentsavaluablecontributiontothefieldofdigitalimageforgerydetection,addressingtheaforementionedconcernswouldstrengthentheoverallqualityandimpactoftheresearch.Irecommendminorrevisionstoaddressthesepointsbeforeconsideringthemanuscriptforpublication.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Dheiver Francisco Santos**
Department, University & Country	**Advanced Center for Smart Technologies, Brazil**