

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_128004
Title of the Manuscript:	YOLOv11: Exploring Variants of Object Detection Models on Custom Datasets
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the performance benchmarking of YOLOv11 object detection models, offering a detailed analysis of their adaptability for diverse application requirements. By evaluating trade-offs between speed and accuracy across different model variants, the study enables researchers and practitioners to make informed decisions when selecting models for real-time detection tasks. The findings contribute to advancing object detection methodologies by presenting a comprehensive dataset and experimental design that can serve as a baseline for future studies. Additionally, the practical implications of this research, particularly in logistics and delivery tracking, demonstrate its potential to bridge the gap between cutting-edge technology and real-world applications, fostering innovation in the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not Suitable, Suggested Topic Performance Benchmarking of YOLOv11 Variants for Real-Time Delivery Vehicle Detection: Accuracy, Speed, and Trade-offs	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overly dense sentences: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Many sentences are long and packed with information, which can overwhelm readers. For instance, the sentence starting with "The dataset includes 2,285 labelled images..." could be split into two for better readability. ii. The section detailing metrics (mAP, precision, etc.) and measurement details could be restructured for clarity. 2. Limited focus on significance: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. While the findings are summarized, the significance of the research or its contribution to the field (beyond logistics and delivery tracking) is not emphasized. For instance, how does this work advance the field of object detection or YOLOv-based research? 3. Lack of numerical or comparative results: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The abstract mentions trade-offs and findings but does not provide specific numerical results or comparisons to support these claims (e.g., how much faster or more accurate each variant is). Even a brief mention would strengthen the conclusions. 4. Repetitive phrasing: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Phrases like "real-world scenarios such as logistics and delivery tracking" and "accuracy, speed, and efficiency" feel redundant. The wording could be varied to maintain reader engagement. 5. Unexplained terms: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The term "IoU thresholds 50-95" is mentioned but not clarified. While this might be familiar to experts, it's good practice to briefly contextualize specialized metrics for broader accessibility. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	no	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English is inconsistent and lack coherency	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph Chukwunweike
Department, University & Country	United Kingdom