

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_123788
Title of the Manuscript:	CLASSIFICATION OF LUNG CANCER USING SUPPORT VECTOR MACHINE WITH FEATURE SELECTION BASED ON PARTICLE SWARM OPTIMIZATION
Type of the Article	Solution 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: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Reviewer like this manuscript. It is because the hybrid technique used is considered that can contribute the society. Besides, the PSO-SVM can be used in other medical approach.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Partially comprehensive. Reviewer suggest adding the summarize of result in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, because not lack of some subsection and also unclear with the structure of article.	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommend adding the summarize of result in the end of abstract.</li> <li>- Need citation for the data or statistics in the introduction part.</li> <li>- Refer to introduction part (d), line 9, suggest to further explain the sentence.</li> <li>- Better to further explain the result with confusion matrix and compare with the similar existing methods.</li> <li>- Suggest following the sequence of the section with Introduction, Related works, Methodology, Results, and Conclusion.</li> </ul>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some of the references did not come from the recent publication. Suggest using the most recent publication, which within 5 years.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avoid using the word "how" and "we" in the article.</li> <li>- Refer abstract line 7, there is the repeatable word – "SVM with".</li> <li>- Refer to introduction part (b), Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC), suggest converting the point form to the table form with some figures.</li> <li>- Refer to introduction part (c), line 6, suggest changing the numbered list to the paragraph. Also, change the term "Below is a flow diagram of PSO algorithms" to "Fig 1 shows a flow diagram of PSO algorithm".</li> <li>- The statement in Fig. 3 not match with the diagram.</li> </ul>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Chee Ka Chin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ViTrox College, Malaysia</b>