

Review – Paper 3

At a first glance, 8 pages of references, for a total of 80 studies, seems a bit excessive. The subject needs to be well covered, but the information also needs to be well filtered.

Also, the references should appear by their order in the text, instead, the first one, for example, is the number 30.

2. Methods

This section does not follow the PRISMA checklist, which was supposed to be used in the making of the systematic review. Instead of exposing the eligibility criteria, information sources, search strategy, selection process, data collection process, the risk of bias and so on, it is exposed the diverse Methods of Deep Learning that are used in Medical Imaging.

3. Results

Figures 1 and 3 are Tables, not Figures, and they include references that are not the ones referenced in the paper.

Figure 2 is incorrectly referenced in the text as Figure 3.

It was only shown applications in 2 areas (Diabetic Retinopathy and Alzheimer's). It would be better to analyse studies from more areas, to better cover the subject of the systematic review.

4. Discussion

Despite only talking about Diabetic Retinopathy and Alzheimer's in the Results section, this section discusses models from other diseases, such as lung diseases, heart diseases, skin diseases and breast diseases. Instead, the discussion should be restricted to the studies shown in the Results section.

5. Future Works

There is no section about "Future Works" in the PRISMA checklist concerning systematic reviews.