

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJOB_123181 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Bridging Prenatal Diagnostics and AI: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Efficacy of Advanced Algorithms in Identifying Congenital Fetal Abnormalities |
| 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) |
|---|---|---|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Fetal structural anomalies represent a particularly challenging area within ultrasound imaging. The detection and recognition of various fetal anomalies are complicated by factors such as size and developmental changes over time. The integration of artificial intelligence in this domain has yielded significant advancements. This manuscript conducts a comprehensive survey of existing techniques and methodologies developed by researchers, offering a thorough literature review and analysis. The summarized literature review provides valuable insights into these techniques and their respective impacts.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>The title "Bridging Prenatal Diagnostics and AI: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Efficacy of Advanced Algorithms in Identifying Congenital Fetal Abnormalities" is indeed well-suited for the manuscript. It accurately reflects the content, which presents a comprehensive review of various techniques and the underlying methodologies associated with the recognition of congenital fetal abnormalities.</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>The current abstract does not effectively capture the essence of the manuscript, as it fails to comprehensively represent the scope of the work. Additionally, it includes irrelevant details, such as the sources from which the authors collected papers or data, like Google Scholar, PubMed, and others. The abstract should instead focus on the significance of identifying congenital fetal abnormalities, emphasizing the importance of accurate detection and the role of advanced techniques in achieving this. It should provide an overview of the manuscript's key contributions, including the systematic review and analysis of existing methodologies, without delving into unnecessary specifics about data collection methods.</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The manuscript lacks proper structure, as evidenced by the missing section and subsection numbering. The flow is disrupted, with results being declared immediately after a brief discussion of methods, which is illogical and inappropriate. Additionally, key sections such as the related work or literature review are absent, leaving the manuscript with only 3-4 sections. To enhance clarity and coherence, the manuscript needs to be restructured with well-defined sections, including a thorough literature review, detailed methodology, and logically sequenced results and discussion sections.</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>The manuscript falls short technically and lacks depth in several key areas. It does not adequately highlight the critical aspects of congenital fetal abnormalities, nor does it provide sufficient detail on the challenges associated with identifying these abnormalities. The manuscript also fails to address the relevant medical terminology, making it difficult for readers to fully grasp the complexity of the subject. To improve its technical rigor, the manuscript should include a comprehensive discussion of the significance of congenital fetal abnormalities, the challenges in their detection, and the relevant medical terminology.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p> | <p>The manuscript, as a review paper, offers only a limited survey on the topic. A more comprehensive and in-depth survey and review are necessary to adequately cover the scope of research in this area. The current review lacks the depth required to fully explore the existing literature, techniques, and methodologies related to the identification of congenital fetal abnormalities. Expanding the survey will provide a more thorough understanding and valuable insights into the field.</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | It's suitable. | |
| Optional/General comments | No, As per my knowledge there is no ethical issues, unless and until the author's have cited the respective other author's/researcher's work. I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer Not sure. Kindly Please check the plagiarism | |

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Name: | Amit Chougule |
| Department, University & Country | BITS, India |