Context [3]:

- Breast cancer has been discussed in detail and importance of diagnosing it early is highlighted in the paper. The main types of breast cancer have been described using the detail found on the instructions. Could you perhaps describe them in your own words and perhaps make it a little bit more concise leaving more space to discuss something else in detail perhaps?
- The sources are out of order, it would seem more professional if the authors were to compile the sources in order from 1-x (your first source mentioned is 6, and doesn't seem to follow any sort of progression, makes it hard to for the reader to refer to the sources)
- the authors talk about the data types used and that they're using machine learning algorithms and the problems of which feature selection methods are best and cite a paper that was previously used and why they have chosen their 3 feature selection methods to classify the microarray samples.

Research question [3]:

- The research question isn't clearly stated in either the abstract or introduction as a question – I understand that you're testing the performance of feature selection methods on their ability to classify breast cancer subtypes by using array- CgH samples but this should be phrased as a research question. This is simple to change though and I understood what you were going for!

Methodology [4]:

- Figure 1 is a great diagram showing the workflow in a very clear concise manner! Great job, with the. inputs and outputs, they make the entire diagram a lot easier to understand. The diagram (Fig1) Makes logical sense.
- There aren't any limitations identified that I came across unfortunately, I think it's important to include that, and is one of the criteria in the draft checking questions.
- The training and feature selection are well accounted for; however, Figure 2 doesn't seem necessary as it has no relation to the paper and merely shows how an SVM optimises the distance separatory lines and the closest data points. This should just be stated and referenced, and doesn't require an image from another paper. There are also some spelling errors in the paragraphs prior to 2.4

Contents/Results [2]:

- The results are quoted from figure 3a, however figure 3a is included in the methods and table 1: which are parameters chosen from using optimisation are in the results –

seems like some reformatting of this will be necessary. Figure 3 a should be in the results

- The results contain figures from others papers and aren't properly compared against each other, instead the authors talk separately about them and fail to make adequate inferences between the two of them.
- If the RQ was stated in a better manner you could make a better reference to it here!

Tables/Figures [3]:

- Figure 2 seems completely irrelevant and figure 4 needs to be compared against fig 3a.
- Figure 1 and 3 are still very good images and give the reader an adequate summary of the results.