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**Reviewer #8**

# Questions

## Please write detailed Comment for - Suitability of Title and quality of the abstract. - Adequacy of literature review and proposed methods -Quality of result analysis and conclusion

This manuscript may be accepted after incorporating the following changes.

. Abstract does not summaries the paper in terms of used method, problem address, performance parameters used etc. Need to rewrite the abstract.

Rewritten

. Address the grammatical and typos mistakes.

Addressed

. Breaks the introduction section into smaller paragraphs.

Made Changes

. Cite recent paper in introduction section and highlight the contribution of the paper.

Made Changes

. Present organisation of paper in separate paragraph.

Mentioned

. In literature section, cite the papers like Kumar et al. [3] proposed exponential spider monkey optimization...

Mentioned

. Improve the quality of figures.

Improved

. Explain proposed scheme with the help of flowchart or algorithm.

Figure 4 is the Flow Chart of Proposed Scheme.

. Arrange the references in proper format.

Arranged as per springer format

. Compare the performance of proposed scheme with recent existing related schemes and also highlight the future scope in conclusion section.

Highlighted

## Overall evaluation

Accept with revision

**Reviewer #9**

# Questions

# 1. Please write detailed Comment for - Suitability of Title and quality of the abstract. - Adequacy of literature review and proposed methods -Quality of result analysis and conclusion

The comments are mentioned below.

1. The abstract lack specific details on methodology, scope of work and research question addressed.

Clarified

1. In the introduction the specific problem that the proposed solution addresses is not clearly defined and the paper does not adequately justify the need for a new approach. The literature review section is relatively brief and does not provide outcomes.

Expanded

1. The paper doesn't provide details about the specific datasets used and their characteristic, justification for using specific preprocessing techniques is not provided and choice of using Inception-ResNet-v2 is not adequately justified.

Justified

1. The results are presented but details of evaluation metrics are improper, does not compare the proposed and there is no discussion on findings and its implications. Figures and tables are not properly integrated in the text.

Refined

1. The conclusion does not offer any specific suggestions for future research, limiting the contribution of the study to the field and do not properly state significance of the findings.

Extended

1. The paper contains grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and instances of incorrect language usage.

Revised

1. Some references lack complete publication information, such as the volume, issue, or page numbers, DOI and lack consistency in formatting. It is too restricted.

Corrected

## 2. Overall evaluation

The paper is accepted with revisions as mentioned above.
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