Review of: "QMH (Quantifying Mental Health) Key Technologies"

Jiafeng Xu[1]

1 China University of Geosciences Wuhan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear author, this manuscript is very interesting as it involves the field of mental health control and other related areas. However, the format presented in this article is very poor, and the graphics and structure are confusing. There are many sentences that need further refinement:

1. The abstract needs to focus on introducing QMH and briefly summarizing the experimental results of the developed QMH technology. Additionally, the background of WKDB should be included in the Introduction section, so that readers can understand the main focus of the article.
2. The Cause and Effect image is clearly a screenshot from a BBC documentary, and is blurry and meaningless. It should be removed or replaced.
3. Figure 1 is blurry and difficult to understand, and should be redrawn. It's recommended to convert the 3D section to 2D for clarity. The core control block diagrams, especially the state and signal parts, should be drawn using standard control block diagrams.
4. Using someone else's image directly in Figure 3 is inappropriate, even though it is more intuitive compared to Figures 1 and 2. It's better for the author to redraw the figure. Also, Figure 3b) is not very useful.
5. A comprehensive literature review should be conducted for WKDB.
6. The arrow directions in the schematic diagram of the open-loop control in Figure 6 are completely confusing. For example, the output signal of the plan evaluator collides with the input signal on the right. Figures 6-8 can be integrated into one control block diagram, and should be simplified and modified.
7. The third coordinate axis in Figure 14 is completely blurry, and its meaning is unclear.
8. Figures 15, 18, and 19 are all screenshots from MATLAB images. As a standard academic paper, the images should be properly processed and output at no less than 600ppi. Figure 15 lacks a specific explanation of the red line, and lacks specific meaning.
9. The tables in this article are all like images, and the format is not consistent. All tables should be standardized as standard three-line tables.
10. The interpretation of the data is unclear, and no conclusions have been drawn.
11. For the methodology used in this article, it's better to present it in a separate chapter rather than simply explaining the external framework. Additionally, the intelligent system mentioned is very confusing. From the perspective of methodology, the perception measurements involved in the article are all based on traditional classical control theory, and there is no mention of intelligent computing. The author should present where specifically the "intelligence" of the

intelligent system lies in more detail.