



BREAST CANCER DIAGNOSIS SYSTEM

Review



Report Title: BREAST CANCER CLASSIFICATION, A NEURAL NETWORK APPROACH

Report Author: ABDUL RAFAY

Reviewed By: MUHAMMAD JALEEL

DECEMBER 10, 2017
NAMAL COLLEGE MIANWALI
www.namal.edu.pk

Review

Report reflects, the author's struggle in collecting data of different experiments in a well formed and well-mannered way. The scientific model of investigation is being followed in overall report but the analysis of different aspects is very less. Most of the experimental results are correct but some of them were not appearing as are submitted in this report. In this document, I'm going to point out few things that need to be revised and will help the reader to understand the presented solution in better way.

Grammar and style of writing:

Report follows most of the grammatical rules, however, there are grammatical mistakes. Some sentences are incomplete and describe nothing, and some of them are too ambiguous. I have highlighted or strike-through the text, having such problem, in a copy of actual report, and will be submitted along with this review. These kind of issues, put a bad impression of the author toward the readers, that's why the report should be error proof in terms of grammar and style of writing.

Settings for different experiments:

Settings for each experiment for testing of different hypothesis, are not clear. For example, the hypothesis regarding training functions of a neural network, is carried out and results are presented but whether the weights and biases for each execution are being saved or not. If each execution have its own configurations, then those must be stated in the report, otherwise default settings must be mentioned in start of experimental and analysis section of the report.

Experimental results:

Some of the results shown in the report, appear to be invalid. I could not reproduce, the same results as are stated in the report. For example, results related to the third hypothesis, covering activation functions, are quite different. Accuracy for `logsig` function goes below 30%. So such kind of mistakes should be removed from the report.

Analysis of results:

The results of experiments, are not analyzed well, if I speak more technically, the results are not analyzed at all. In the report, after the experiment is completed, usually it is stated that whether the results confirm or deny our hypothesis. The portion, why is it happening so, of analysis, is missing in the report. Such a crucial part of analysis must be added be added to discover or try to discover the hidden truths.

Note: There is a file named “Commented Copy.pdf” is being attached with this file and can be found in same repository as of this file. It contains few highlighted and strike-through sentences. By clicking them, you can see the comments in comments sections of Adobe viewer tool. (In Adobe Acrobat Reader: View>Tools>Comments)