

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRCOS_112743 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Application of Stacked Ensemble Techniques on Ensemble Feature Selection Model for Classifying Recurrent Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Prognosis |
| Type of the Article | Research Article |

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>Yes, using machine learning techniques for classification and prediction of Carcinoma is commendable.</p> <p>No, Application of Stacked Ensemble Techniques on Classifying Recurrent Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Prognosis</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | No | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>1. The content delivery needs to be improved. Overall English needs to be improved.</p> <p>2. In section 2, Algorithm 1, 2, 3 no explanation were given.</p> <p>3. In section 4, Table 2, 3 contents were not referred in the manuscript.</p> <p>4. In section 5, Table 11, 12, 13 data are repeated from the Table 7, 8, 9, 10 and it is showing no significance.</p> <p>5. In section 5, the interpretations of the results can be improved.</p> <p>6. In section 7, the order of referring can be improved. Referring like [4,2] rather [2,4].</p> <p>7. In section 7, the details about few referred papers are incomplete.</p> <p>8. In section 7, Reference 1,11,17,31 papers are not referred inside the manuscript.</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

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: | R. Kavitha |
| Department, University & Country | Parisutham Institute of Technology & Science, India |