Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_76567**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Deep Learning Predictive Models of Molecular Phenotypes for Overall Survival in Cancer**
Type of the Article	**Systematic review**

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Dear Authors, thank you very much for selecting such interesting topic for your systematic review. I had took a time and gone through your paper and put my comments as follows. • In the abstract, the author conclude that there must be proper knowledge of deep learning to conduct imaging process. This first sentence of the conclusion is wrong. • Because, the concept/science of deep learning and image processing is very different, but they can cooperate in artificial intelligence in order bring better performance in medical image processing. • From background first line, it is not possible to conclude that cancer is the a very slowly developing disease, because hematological cancers (such as acute leukemia) can grow rapidly and show their symptom early. • From Figure 2, the author concluded that DL on improvement can help to obtain a much clearer image. This is unlikely conclusion. The paper result (Yalaet al. 2019) does not led to such type of conclusion. The authors need to work with biomedical and/or computer engineers to have clear understanding of the difference. • Starting from Figure 2 to Figure 8, the authors did not caption it the figures and not mention inside the text. The figures were not explicated well.	
Minor REVISION comments	• In the abstract methodology section (the first line), the author want to do analyses the image-processing concept in deep learning, but the way it has been written on the first line of the sentence is not good/wrong and imagining need to be rewrite as imaging. (I have highlighted in the manuscript)	
Optional/General comments	• I suggest the title to be amended as: Deep learning-based models of molecular phenotypes for predicting the overall survival in cancer. • In the abstract result section: It is better to improve the English usage and repeated words need to be reduced in order to attract the readers. • Correct the word Pub Med to PubMed, hystopathological to histopathological (page 12), • The authors need to amend their English usage and improve their writing.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Kokeb Dese***
Department, University & Country	***Jimma University, Ethiopia***