

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
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	

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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Average. The diagrams in the manuscript are not sufficient and not properly labelled. The result shown in the table is not been justified with any evidences like output screens, graphs etc.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title should not be that lengthy. It should be short comparatively stating the facts and procedures.	
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.	Okay	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not Sufficient. The subsection should contain detail of the procedures, output, and discussions.	
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.	Clear specification of the output should be displayed and analysed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Only one reference of 2020 is there which is also not sufficient. As well the other references are more old, where as there are lot of articles available in the recent periods.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Okay	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It can be written in far better way.	

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:	Jyotsnarani Tripathy
Department, University & Country	India