

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JCTI_118744</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence in Thyroid Cancer Screening and Diagnosis: A Comprehensive Systematic Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Systematic Review</b>

### **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.journaljcti.com/index.php/JCTI/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>May be useful if it is enhanced properly or the paper is rewritten with specific content related to the topic</p> <p>Quite ok when compared with current content in the paper</p> <p>Can be improved</p> <p>No, it's not explaining the importance of study in elaborate manner</p> <p>The survey done was quite correct</p> <p>That's ok.</p> <p>The methodology on why this study is done can be provided in the paper so that the readers can get technical knowledge the topic</p> <p>Objectives mentioned can be rewritten and reframed clearly.</p> <p>English language can be improved in the paper</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sankara Malliga G
Department, University & Country	Anand Institute of Higher Technology, India