

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_125406
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of Deep Learning Based Object Detection Algorithms
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The article presents a comprehensive review of object detection algorithms, but the structure could benefit from clearer section divisions. Consider introducing sub-headings to separate traditional, deep learning, and transformer-based techniques for better readability.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	While the paper provides a detailed overview of the evolution of object detection, the explanation of some algorithms (e.g., DETR and Swin Transformer) could be further elaborated with more technical insights. Including mathematical formulations or pseudocode would improve the technical depth.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The article includes a solid set of references but should ensure all key claims are properly cited. For instance, certain performance claims regarding YOLO and SSD models lack direct citation to original benchmarks or papers. Ensuring consistency in citation format as per Journal guidelines is also recommended. The use of figures and tables is commendable, but several figures (e.g., Figure 1 on the evolution of object detection) could be more clearly labeled. Ensure that all visual aids are referenced in the text and include informative captions following Journal standards.	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor Revision	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The conclusion touches on future trends and challenges, but these could be expanded to provide more actionable insights. Suggestions for overcoming specific challenges like small object detection or real-time processing would strengthen the paper's contribution to the field.	

Review Form 3

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:	K. Venkatesh
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India