Review of: "FLAML-Boosted XGBoost Model for Autism Diagnosis: A Comprehensive Performance Evaluation"

Waqas Haider Bangyal[1]

1 University of Gujrat

- The work is of limited novelty. It is not technically challenging.

- The proposed method lacks motivation and justifications. More advantages should be discussed in detail,

- The paper contains a number of grammatical errors and can be better organized with more definitions.

- In introduction, the authors take several paragraphs to introduce the background while they are not very relevant to the task of age prediction.

- References must be updated and it seems that authors need to refer to latest work to justify the current approach

- Firstly,, authors should provide more specific comments of the cited papers after introducing each relevant work. What readers require is, by convinced literature review, to understand the clear thinking/consideration why the proposed approach can reach more convinced results. This is the very contribution from authors. In addition, authors also should provide more sufficient critical literature review to indicate the drawbacks of existed approaches, then, well define the main stream of research direction, how did those previous studies perform? Employ which methodologies? Which problem still requires to be solved? Why is the proposed approach suitable to be used to solve the critical problem? It needs more convinced literature reviews to indicate clearly the state-of-the-art development.

- Overall work is average but the organization/presentation of the paper is ordinary. It seems that this paper was submitted without careful and thorough review of the work. Writing and references need correction and there are many flaws in write-up and need to be removed. The work still needs to be refined and presentation of the work also needs to be improved. There are several editing and language issues which need to be addressed in terms of technicality and contributions, I don't believe there are many! Proposed methodology need to be elaborated with more detail and how it is efficient must be stated.

- The major weakness of the paper is the limited additional knowledge given here. - I failed to figure out what this study was trying to achieve. The paper as it is unfortunately does not provide any new information. There are several misspellings throughout the paper, time to time making it hard to understand. Always a careful proof-reading should be done before submitting a paper.

- Consider the following studies in the reference section:

- An Improved Particle Swarm Optimization Algorithm for Data Classification
- Analysis of learning rate using CPN algorithm for hand written character recognition application

- The technical quality of this paper is quite low. Although theoretical concepts and related literature are properly

introduced, some of the references are outdated and should be omitted. Moreover, the number of recent literature is low

- The quality of the figures is poor.
- Section conclusion is too short and the future directions must be written.