

Peer Review

Review of: "ColonNet: A Hybrid of DenseNet121 and U-Net Model for Detection and Segmentation of GI Bleeding"

Noppakun Boonsim¹

1. Khon Kaen University, Thailand

1. The article lacks a comprehensive review of the state-of-the-art in [specific area, e.g., medical image analysis for bleeding detection, deep learning for image segmentation]. A more thorough literature review is required to contextualize the proposed work within the existing body of knowledge.
2. The related work section should be expanded to include a more detailed discussion of relevant prior work. This should not only list previous studies but also critically analyze their methodologies, strengths, and limitations.
3. A comparative performance analysis against established architectures such as VGG16, Inception, and DenseNet201 is necessary to benchmark the proposed method. This comparison should be conducted using the same dataset and evaluation metrics to ensure a fair and objective assessment.
4. The article should provide a more detailed explanation of the evaluation metrics used.
5. The article should include a more extensive comparison with other existing bleeding detection and segmentation methods.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.