



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_68220
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Between Two Systems Using Deep Learning for Detection And Classification Leukocytes in Leukemia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI 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	<p>In this paper, the authors' compared between two proposed systems for computer-aided diagnosis (CAD) to detect and classify three types of white blood cells which are fundamental of an acute leukemia diagnosis. Both systems depend on the You Only Look Once (YOLOv2) algorithm based on convolutional neural network (CNN). The first system detects and classifies leukocytes at the same time called computer-aided diagnosis with one model (CADM1). The second system separates detection and classification by using two models called computer-aided diagnosis with two models (CADM2)., also discusses the comparisons between the existing schemes with different domains. However, there are weak aspects of the paper as listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall presentation quality needs to be improved. 2. Revisions in terms of grammar and sentence structure are required, together with spelling errors. 3. Does the title of the paper accurately reflect the major focus contribution of this paper. 4. Please suggest change of the title as appropriate within 10 words. 5. The Authors didn't mention to the Figure 1 and 2, Are these figures your own or they drawn from other Papers? 6. Add more information about the Figure 4. 7. Can the Authors add more explanation for CNN in the Figure 5. 8. Please kindly writing the references depending in the IEEE style with using some reference for this year (2020). <p>Hence, For all these reasons, I think that the paper needs minor revision to consider all the above mentioned comments , and i recommend to accept the publish this paper in the AJRCOS after conducting the above recommendations.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Bashar Jabbar Hamza
Department, University & Country	Al-Furat Al-Awsat Technical University, Iraq