# Qeios

Peer Review

# Review of: "Deep Learning in Palmprint Recognition-A Comprehensive Survey"

**Felix Marattukalam**[1]

1. Electrical Computer and Software Engineering, University of Auckland, New Zealand

The introduction is well-drafted with current findings and strong technical backing.

Table 1 is descriptive and highlights the value of this review, distinguishing it from materials already available online.

The contribution and structure of the paper are well established and clearly presented in Section 1.

The authors have investigated generic neural networks and delved into the key elements of traditional ML/DL architectures.

Please review the formatting of the paper to ensure consistency. For example, **Mean Squared Error (MSE) Loss** is not bold in Section 2, whereas other terms are.

Consider renaming **Section 3** to **Preprocessing** for clarity.

**Figure 3** effectively illustrates how palm print technology has evolved over time, particularly in the feature extraction stage.

The concepts of **closed-set** and **open-set** are essentially equivalent to **identification** and **recognition** in biometric terminology. Ensure this is explicitly mentioned so that a broader audience in biometrics research can fully appreciate the content of this paper.

In **Section 5**, the **Countermeasures** subsection would benefit from additional information on **privacy-preserving templates** and how they enhance the robustness of biometric systems.

The authors have also provided valuable information on datasets, which is crucial for a comprehensive evaluation of methods in this paper.

In **Section 8 (Evaluation)**, consider introducing the **confusion matrix** before elaborating on the metrics derived from it.

For **Table 3,** consider using **landscape format** to improve readability and save space.

The inference presented in **Section 9** is insightful and effectively conveys the authors' perspective on the review.

Perform a thorough **spell check and grammar review**.

Ensure **consistent formatting** throughout the paper.

Implement the suggested **structural and content improvements** for better clarity and readability.

Overall, I am satisfied with this review paper. This publication will be valuable to the broader research community.

## Declarations

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.