Structure and Presentation (Organised Progression/Clarity of writing**):**

Your review is coherent and informative. However, you covered the topic in a descriptive manner.

You structured your review well, with a good introduction, an attempt to analyse the literature, an argument, and a conclusion. However, there are three specific things you can do to improve your review:

-        No need for the subsections (1.1, 1.2, and 1.3) these issues could be mentioned in subparagraphs in your introduction or the background section.

-        You have to provide some visual aid to help the readers understand how the DL algorithms perform plus the critical discussion and the comparative arguments in such topics.

-        Topic history is better to be part of the introduction/ background.

 Good, you have structured the material in a way that allows for a logical sequence of ideas.

Knowledge and Understanding: Coverage of content/Topic definition:

A good level of knowledge and understanding has been demonstrated. The topic has been covered from different perspectives, with many pieces of evidence showing your ability to analyse the literature and to discuss the limitations and the challenges.

There are many basic concepts in DL should have been defined and elaborated such as the artificial neuron, NN layers and the functionality of each layer, etc.

Good, the review addressed the limitations and proposed a direction for future work on this topic, well done!

I would like to see:

You provided a good range of relevant contemporary literature. However, you should use peer-reviewed articles or books for the basic concepts rather than IBM cloud education.

Critical discussion & synthesis of ideas/reading:

Your comprehension is very clear and you express your learning well. In terms of criticality, this could be further strengthened by the inclusion of more technical discussion. However, a range of references has been used to good effect with limited analysis and argumentation.

You concluded your review in an excellent way. It would have been better if you critically discussed the different DL models Single Layer Perceptron Model and the Multiple Layer Perceptron Model. You provide the citation without discussing your ideas or comparative arguments about the provided models. I would like to see more depth discussions with your own arguments.

Clearly, you addressed the gaps.

When you consider these issues, I believe you will improve your works in the future.

The Turnitin report shows a match of   21%

Please pay attention to the word count in the future your report consists of about 2181 words this could affect your grades according to the report writing guidelines.