**Report remarks:**

Introduction:  
- Add references to literature of IR and ML techniques for prostate segmentation from MRI. Refer to the obtained results.  
- What should our research aim be?  
Right now: “*The goal of this paper is to find a method that best performs prostate segmentation*.”  
I propose something like: “The goal of this research is to compare a simple image registration approach to a deep learning approach for prostate segmentation of prostate cancer MR images.” (Gets rid of ‘best’)

Methods:  
- Really needs to be cleaned up and made more cohesive. Think about the subsection titles and the order of the subsections.  
- No need to mention that we converted the 3D data to 2D if you ask me. Just mention that the data consists of transverse consecutive images.

Results:  
- Rewrote to make it more academic and descriptive.   
- What should we discuss in the results? First IR results, then ML results and only compare them in discussion section! For both the following should be reported/shown: DICE score, 95th-percentile Hausdorff distance, relatively good test result, test result that has quite different segmentation, and test result that has no predicted mask when the GT did or vise versa.

Discussion:  
- Interpret the IR and ML results separately shortly. Then compare both to each other!  
- Followed by limitations of both methods.  
- Then limitations in general.  
- Future research.   
- What is our conclusion wrt IR results? I would say it is not accurate enough for direct use but could serve as a starting point for a clincian perhaps.   
- Refer back to main goal and explicitly mention why both methods did not work well (if they both didn’t work well).