Feedback report on the report of Bilal Ahmed Khan.

**Critical Review and General Feedback**

1. The introduction of the report is perfectly explained, which covers all the aspects of adopted methodology (Neural Network Approach).
2. Background covers the structure and working of neural network, which is perfectly explained.
3. The related work (relevant approaches in the classification of breast cancer) is missing in the report.
4. Main part of the report is contained on the pre-processing of the dataset. Although it is not clearly explained that what would be the data set and what are the attributes of the dataset.
5. You did replace 2, 4 with 0, 1 in the output column, because you were supposed to use tansig as the transfer function and the output range of tansig is [0,1] (as per narrated by you), but [0,1] is just range in which all values will be mapped, so if you use 2, 4 or 0,1 at output layer the accuracy shouldn’t effect. Isn’t it?
6. The hypothesis are well explained and the experiments on the base of hypothesis are well explained.
7. In your hypothesis 4.2 (role of activation function). (As per your results the purelin should produce good results as compare to other functions). But the when you used tansig on the input layer and purlin on output layer, the accuracy suppressed. Although final output is calculated by purelin, then why there is deviation from expected behaviour?
8. The conclusion is not well explanatory, as it is not covering nuts and bolts of above mentioned experiments.

**Suggestions**

1. Please include previous work on the breast cancer classification and the reason that why you did choose neural network to address that issue.
2. You can add some snaps of neural network to intensify the understanding of reader.
3. The description about the dataset should be clear that what are the attributes and what are the values of various attributes of used dataset.
4. Your hypotheses about number of neurons, there can be multiple reasons that why you didn’t approach the goal with the less numbers of neurons. You should cover them too.
5. The citations about the websites/ resource from where you got the dataset should be mentioned.
6. The style of citation and referencing can be improved.

**Verdict**

Although there are some aspects which need consideration, but overall flow and experiments are well explained. So verdict for that report is **Accepted**.