

Peer Review

Review of: "Fall Detection in Passenger Elevators using Intelligent Surveillance Camera Systems: An Application with YoloV8 Nano Model"

Han Sun¹

1. State University of New York at Binghamton, United States

While the topic is interesting, the overall structure and clarity need significant improvement.

1. In the introduction, the paper lacks sufficient supporting evidence for its arguments. What evidence do you have to justify the importance of this study? Are there reports or studies indicating the dangers of falls, particularly in elevators? Why did you choose an **elevator** as the scenario? How is fall detection in an elevator different from general fall detection scenarios? None of these questions are addressed, making the motivation for this study unclear.
2. The Literature Review section presents papers related to general fall detection but does not establish their relevance to the specific scenario of an elevator. How do these studies contribute to your research problem? The reviewed works seem disconnected from the core topic, as they do not discuss challenges unique to an elevator environment. If there is no prior research on fall detection in elevators, you should explicitly highlight this gap and explain why it is significant. Without such clarification, the literature review appears unfocused and unrelated to the paper's main research question.
3. Additionally, the paper lacks a clear **technical roadmap** outlining what was done in the research. It seems that the authors merely applied an existing model without any modifications or significant improvements. What is the actual **contribution** of this study? Did you develop a new algorithm, improve an existing method, or introduce novel evaluation criteria? Without a detailed methodology explaining the step-by-step approach, it is difficult to determine the originality and technical depth of the work.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.