Comprehensive Evaluation of Feature Extractors in Computer Vision: An Empirical Analysis

Manuscript Number: (#97467)

Comments:

1. Add Limitations of the proposed study need to be discussed before conclusion.
2. There are any Enhancement on your work? or you are applied the algorithms directly? Please clarify it. And what is the different between another works? Your comparison is not clear. If you are using the algorithms directly without any modification, so what is the main contribution in your work.
3. Abbreviations were used recklessly without any initial definition. Please define all the keywords before abbreviating them.
4. The novelty of this paper is not apparent, you should highlight your contribution in the end of introduction in detail.
5. In the paper, there are no mathematical equations. Why? Did you use the equations or not?
6. Remove (we) you have many. Replace with, for example (This study) or (The proposed model).
7. The related work section should provide more information about the differences between the cited solutions and the proposed paper, exposing the improvements introduced.
8. Analysis is required for each experiment to show its main purpose. Furthermore, the paper needs clear flow diagram for all proposed steps.
9. In table 6, author show results, how these results were generated. How author verify that his/her accuracy is best than other.
10. Need to put some simple of data in your study, and how did you deal with it.
11. Were there any potential limitations in the selection of the datasets used in the study, and how might this impact the generalizability of the findings to other applications?
12. Overall, the basic background is not introduced well, where the notations are not illustrated much clear. I recommend the authors to employ certain intuitive examples to elaborate the essential notations.