

# Review of: "SnakeChat: a conversational-AI based app for snake classification"

Boopathy Prabadevi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vellore Institute of Technology

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper is technically sound, but requires proper organization of contents, flow and good of expressing the results.

1. Spellings and grammar need to be corrected throughout the manuscript: EG: "in section 2.1.3 It can interpreter complex images" , "in section 2.2.2 Bellow"

2. Some of the statements require proper references and should be reframed: Eg: in section 2.1.3 "we have also tested in collaboration with another author this algorithm applied to medical images": who is that author ??

3. Section: 2.2.1 "ChatGPT is a pretrained model, as it is MobileNet largely used for image identification."

4. "They have released what is called GPTs. It can be trained to better read images; the authors discussed with another author training those GPTs, and the results are promising."

5. It is very difficult to understand the meaning of these statements, It would be better, if you could reframe them.

6. The authors have compared the work with MobileNet often, implementation screenshots to describe how they differ must be provided.

7. How "Big model and small model " is been characterized? Parameters for effective conversation should be added.

8. In Fig.2, the arrows are not visible as well text size can be increased. "Gather all information for response" what information is expected?? sample can be given

9. Similar variations on responses can be give as a tabular format

10. GPT responses can be given a figure number and name

Overall: Results section should be strengthened with proper comparison with literature, table representations and figures. Also source for the images must be highlighted