

## Review of: "An Improved Hybrid Transfer Learning-Based Deep Learning Model for Alzheimer's Disease Detection Using CT and MRI Scans"

Waqar Hussain

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study needs a lot of improvements.

- 1. The quality of the figures is extremely low. Also, the figures are not informative, but more generic.
- 2. It is suggested to provide a clearer diagram of the overall model architecture and the flowchart of the whole experiment.
- 3. Confusion matrix is a very basic way of evaluation. However, if authors have opted to do so, they must provide the confusion matrix for all models.
- 4. Explain how you computed false positives or false negatives as the study is based on multiclass classification.
- 5. Please improve Section 6 "Discussion and Significance of the Proposed Work". Compare your work exhaustively with the existing approaches.
- 6. Provide specific details for parameters and how you tune your hyperparameters to enhance the reproducibility of the study.
- 7. Share the source code in a GitHub repository, or provide a working demo as a web application for public usage.
- 8. There is some issue with the order and captions of Figures 4 and 5.
- 9. Also, the evaluation of DenseNet121 is missing.
- 10. Table numbers are also incorrect.
- 11. Explain the results and your findings in detail. For example, you have just cited the figures or tables. We know that Figure 6 Accuracy and loss plot generated by the VGG 16 but what did you find from it?
- 12. Also, "the classification report generated by the model on the specified dataset is shown in Table 3." So what do you infer/conclude from it?