Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback *(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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	**Comments for Improvement:**	

Comments for Improvement:

1. **Abstract:**
   - **The abstract effectively summarizes the study but could benefit from concise phrasing. Consider reducing repetitive mentions of machine learning algorithms and focusing on key takeaways. Highlight the most significant result or application explicitly.**
2. **Introduction:**
   - **The introduction is informative but could emphasize the research gap more distinctly. Add a clearer statement on how the proposed methods address current challenges in skin cancer detection.**
3. **Challenges in Skin Cancer Detection:**
   - **Expand the "Misdiagnosis" section with examples of common misdiagnoses and their impact on patient outcomes. Adding a brief mention of emerging tools addressing these issues would be valuable.**
4. **Role of Machine Learning:**
   - **The section could be enriched with more specific examples of machine-learning applications in dermatology. For example, briefly mention how algorithms have been used in real-world telemedicine platforms.**
5. **Algorithms and Techniques:**
   - **Clarify the unique strengths of various machine learning models (e.g., CNNs vs. ensemble models). Use visual aids like comparative graphs or flowcharts to enhance understanding.**
6. **Related Work:**
   - **Provide critical analysis instead of summarizing related studies. Highlight what was missing in past research and how this paper addresses those gaps. Use a table format more effectively by including direct comparisons.**
7. **Figures:**
   - **The figures provided are helpful but lack detailed captions. Add descriptive captions explaining their relevance to the study.**
8. **Discussion:**
   - **Discuss the limitations and challenges of implementing the proposed machine learning models in clinical settings, such as data privacy, ethical concerns, or hardware constraints.**
9. **Conclusion:**
   - **The conclusion should explicitly state the future implications of the findings and suggest specific next steps for researchers and practitioners.**
10. **References:**

- **Ensure all references are updated and follow a consistent citation style. Highlight if specific papers significantly influenced the study.**

1. **Language and Style:**

- **Simplify technical jargon for broader accessibility without compromising scientific rigor.**
- **Remove redundancy (e.g., repetitive mentions of dataset diversity).**

1. **Formatting:**

- **Ensure all sections follow a consistent format. For instance, the headings for challenges, algorithms, and deep learning could benefit from a hierarchical structure to**

	improve readability.	

	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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ahmed El-Sayed Saq**
Department, University & Country	**Mansoura University, Egypt**