Feedback report on the report of Hassan Ahmad.

**Critical Review and General Feedback**

As you had to right the technical report, so you had be very careful about technical writing techniques.

1. Abstract is out of order, no table of contents.
2. No proper formatting and colour scheme.
3. Very brief overview of artificial neural networks, nothing about repeated learning stages and assigning of connection weights.
4. Unnecessary details about previous work done on breast cancer.
5. Principle rules for a neural network have been totally ignored.
6. Detail explanation about the creation of neural network but overall main part was poorly addressed because there is no discussion about adapted methodology and system architecture.
7. Data normalization is explained very well.
8. In the results of you first hypothesis I am unable to figure out whether it was activation or training function that stood responsible for effective results but as you say it was learning rate, so suppose it is learning rate and due to their greater movement towards right side. Right? I want to enquire why they behaved so? And how it effects the accuracy? As for as my knowledge is concerned we could assign weights are initially it could take random weights and after learning and testing weights are changed accordingly.
9. What exactly is the second hypothesis? Different activation functions behave differently or using logsig at output layer will reduce the accuracy? And in the result part your analysis couldn’t make sense because logsig is log-sigmoid transfer function which ranges from -1 to +1, tansig is also a log-sigmoid transfer function with the same range. So tansig should also behave the same regardless of its position? I might be wrong but ranges wouldn’t have do anything with the accuracy!
10. Third hypothesis absolutely correct.
11. Fourth hypothesis works better but the functionality of neurons explained is very little. Actually the reason behind success of the hypothesis is not up to mark.
12. Detailed results against every experiment was good.
13. Conclusion is good but only concerns explanation of neural networks not there undiscovered helping tools.

**Suggestions**

* Go for better formatting, colour scheme and other technicalities.
* Stay focussed what have been asked.
* Do follow the principle rules for NN.
* Very little use of scientific language go for better script.
* Reduce unnecessary explanations and provide detail reasoning.

**Verdict**

There exit some deficiencies regarding technical and reasoning aspects but overall flow of the report and domain knowledge is sound, so the decision for this report is **accepted**.