

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

Compulsory 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>
<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>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</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>1. Abstract and Findings: The abstract lacks clarity and specificity regarding the findings of the study. It does not mention any results or conclusions drawn from the experiments. Including specific outcomes, such as the accuracy improvements achieved with PSO-ROC feature selection compared to other methods, would provide more insight into the effectiveness of the proposed approach.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>2. Methodology: The methodology is not described in sufficient detail. The process of applying Particle Swarm Optimization with Rate of Change (PSO-ROC) for feature selection and how it integrates with the Support Vector Machine (SVM) classification needs to be clearly explained. The steps involved in each of the three classification methods (SVM without feature selection, SVM with PSO, and SVM with PSO-ROC) should be outlined in detail to understand how they compare. . Proposed Model: The proposed model and its relevance are not clearly reflected in the paper. The abstract should explicitly state the novel aspects of the model and how it contributes to improving lung cancer classification. Additionally, a clear explanation of why PSO-ROC was chosen as a feature selection method over other techniques would enhance the relevance of the proposed model.</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>Results and Data: While the results and database used in the study are mentioned as satisfactory, they are not discussed in the abstract. Providing a summary of the key results and how they support the effectiveness of the proposed methods would strengthen the paper. This includes discussing any performance metrics, such as accuracy or computational efficiency, and how they compare between the different methods.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>Overall Quality: The overall presentation of the paper needs improvement. The abstract and methodology sections should be revised to provide a clearer, more comprehensive description of the study and its findings. Ensuring that the proposed model is well-articulated and that the results are explicitly detailed will improve the quality of the paper.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Recommendation: The paper, in its current form, does not meet the required standards for publication. The abstract and methodology need substantial revision to provide a clearer, more detailed account of the research. The results should be explicitly stated, and the relevance of the proposed model should be better highlighted. suggesting a thorough revision before reconsideration.	

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:	Rakesh Kumar Yadav
Department, University & Country	IIT, India