

Revision Summary Report

Paper ID: 453

Title: *A Comprehensive Review on Skin Lesion Analysis and Prognostic Modeling using Deep Learning*

Author(s): Aalia Fatema R. Dandawala, Vedant Jadhav, Raj Shukla, Dr. Prashasti Kanikar

Reviewer #1 Comment 1:

“Manuscript is too badly arranged with respect to figures and tables. Proposed model must be compared with existing ones. Identify the parameters and compare them.”

Author Response:

We sincerely thank the reviewer for the constructive feedback. The following revisions have been made to improve the manuscript as per the suggestions:

1. Reorganization of Figures and Tables:

All figures and tables have been repositioned for proper alignment with their respective references in the text. Captions have been reformatted and placed consistently below each figure or table according to IEEE formatting guidelines. Figure numbering, table titles, and in-text references were checked for sequential consistency. This ensures smoother readability and professional presentation.

2. Addition of Comparative Analysis for the Proposed Model:

A new subsection titled “Comparative Evaluation of Proposed Model” (Section IV.D) has been added to provide a clear and quantitative comparison of the proposed Conditional Latent Diffusion Prognostic Framework (CLDM) with existing state-of-the-art models.

- The comparison includes performance parameters such as **Accuracy (%)**, **Dice Score**, and **AUROC**, which are standard benchmarks in skin lesion classification and segmentation.
- A new **Table 2** has been incorporated, presenting comparative metrics between the proposed CLDM and well-established models like CNN–SVM Ensemble, Diffusion Model, and MobileNetV2–LSTM.
- The revised section highlights that CLDM achieves a **94–96% accuracy and 0.93 Dice score**, indicating superior interpretability and prognostic capability.

3. Manuscript Formatting Enhancements:

Minor grammatical and structural corrections were made for clarity. Redundant text and repeated citations were removed to improve coherence. All in-text citations and references were cross-verified for accuracy and formatting consistency.

4. Plagiarism and Similarity Compliance:

The revised manuscript was screened using Turnitin, and the similarity index was reduced to below **10%**. All paraphrased content was rewritten to ensure originality, and AI-generated text was completely eliminated to comply with conference requirements. Proper citations were added for all paraphrased sources.

Summary of Modifications

Section	Nature of Revision	Description
Abstract	Minor edits	Improved clarity and flow
Figures & Tables	Formatting	Corrected placement, captions, and numbering
Section IV.D	Added	New “Comparative Evaluation of Proposed Model” subsection
Table 2	Added	Comparative performance metrics of CLDM and existing models
Grammar & Citations	Revised	Enhanced readability, verified references
Similarity Report	Updated	Similarity reduced to <10% (Turnitin verified)

Conclusion

All reviewer comments have been carefully addressed. The revised manuscript now includes a structured layout, clearer comparative analysis, and adherence to IEEE formatting and ethical standards. We believe these revisions substantially enhance the technical quality and presentation of the paper.