This review evaluates two drafts of the "Related Works" chapter: `first_draft.md` and `final_chapter.md`.

***

Evaluation of Document 1: `first_draft.md`

Comprehensiveness (1–10): 8
Justification: The chapter covers a broad and relevant set of themes, including foundational work, medical imaging, XAI, federated learning, and domain-specific applications. Key papers like Esteva et al. (2017) and Topol (2019) are included, demonstrating good coverage of seminal and high-impact work.

Relevance (1–10): 9
Justification: All thematic sections are directly focused on the core topic of AI in healthcare, avoiding irrelevant digressions. The works cited within each subsection clearly relate to the specific theme (e.g., Li et al. (2021) for federated learning).

Organization & Structure (1–10): 8
Justification: The structure is highly logical, organized thematically into specific application areas like 'Medical Imaging' and 'XAI,' which helps the reader navigate the landscape. The flow is good, moving from general overviews to specific, specialized applications.

Critical Analysis (1–10): 6
Justification: The analysis is present but generally superficial. For each citation, the author includes one sentence on the "approach/results" and one sentence on a "limitation," which often feels formulaic and lacks a deeper synthesis or comparison between *multiple* works within a section.

Clarity & Readability (1–10): 8
Justification: The writing is clear, concise, and uses appropriate academic language. The structure with clear headings makes the chapter highly accessible, although some justification sentences are repetitive (e.g., citing a "survey nature" as a limitation).

Citation Quality & Accuracy (1–10): 9
Justification: The chapter includes a mix of foundational works (e.g., Jiang et al. (2017), Libbrecht and Noble (2015)) and recent publications (e.g., O'Connell et al. (2022), Ras et al. (2022)). The citations appear to be reliable and accurately support the claims.

Average Score: 8.0

Final Summary (`first_draft.md`)

This first draft of the Related Works chapter is a strong foundation, characterized by excellent **Comprehensiveness** and **Relevance** to the field of AI in healthcare. The chapter’s organization is logical, employing a thematic structure that effectively maps out the research landscape, covering a wide range of topics from foundational papers to MIoT and pandemic response. However, the chapter’s primary weakness lies in its **Critical Analysis**; the discussion tends toward summarizing individual papers rather than synthesizing or contrasting findings across multiple works, with the "limitation" sentence often feeling boilerplate. The concluding sections, particularly the Identified Research Gaps, are solid, and the overall clarity and citation quality are very good. The chapter successfully contextualizes the study and provides a clear roadmap of the current state of the art, but would benefit from a more nuanced and in-depth critical discussion.

***

Evaluation of Document 2: `final_chapter.md`

Comprehensiveness (1–10): 9
Justification: Like the first draft, it covers an excellent breadth of topics and includes foundational and highly relevant

literature. The scope is suitably broad for an introductory chapter on AI in healthcare, successfully covering all the sub-fields mentioned in the introduction.

Relevance (1–10): 9
Justification: All literature is directly applicable to the research problem of AI in healthcare, with thematic sections keeping the cited works highly relevant. The document maintains a strong focus without introducing tangential topics.

Organization & Structure (1–10): 9
Justification: The thematic organization is logical and effective, making the chapter easy to follow. The chapter improves its flow by slightly expanding the Critical Discussion and Gaps sections, effectively leading the reader toward the *Synthesis* and the present study's contribution.

Critical Analysis (1–10): 8
Justification: This criterion shows significant improvement over the first draft. The author now provides a more detailed, multi-faceted critique of the cited works (e.g., on Esteva et al. (2017) discussing limited generalizability *and* potential dataset bias). The Critical Discussion section (2.3) is also richer, explicitly naming ethical and regulatory concerns.

Clarity & Readability (1–10): 9
Justification: The writing is exceptionally clear, concise, and academic. The subtle but important expansions of the critical points enhance the prose, and the use of headings and structure maintains high accessibility.

Citation Quality & Accuracy (1–10): 9
Justification: The quality remains high, featuring established, high-impact papers and recent reviews. The content is accurately attributed, and the chapter shows an excellent mix of seminal (2015, 2017) and contemporary (2021, 2022) works.

Average Score: 8.8

Final Summary (`final_chapter.md`)

This final version of the Related Works chapter demonstrates a significant improvement, elevating its quality to near-excellent. Its strengths lie in the exceptional **Organization & Structure**, which thematically guides the reader through the diverse landscape of AI in healthcare, and its high **Relevance** and **Comprehensiveness**. Crucially, the **Critical Analysis** is much stronger, moving past simple summaries to provide more nuanced critiques of generalizability, bias, and practical implementation challenges for individual papers. The chapter also successfully frames the identified research gaps, which are then explicitly addressed in the detailed *Synthesis* section by linking them directly to the proposed research (AI-driven diagnosis of skin cancer). Overall, the chapter thoroughly contextualizes the proposed study, clearly articulating the state of the art and defining the novelty of the present work.