

Reviewer Report

In general, the topic invested in this paper is interesting and meets the scope of the journal. Experimental results confirm the system's effectiveness. The paper is well written, and the results seem to be reasonable. The authors should revise the paper to further improve its quality before I vote for an acceptance. My comments are as follows:

- 1- Author must keep the abstract in the following format:
 - a) Introduction about the requirement of proposed work.
 - b) Drawbacks of existing work.
 - c) The proposed work.
 - d) Which dataset is used.
- 2- In introduction, author should mention specifically the one paragraph of drawbacks of existing work and how the proposed methodology resolves that problem. To be more precise author can add one tabular format of existing work.
- 3- The literature review needs to be improved (length, comprehension, etc.).
- 4- A deeper theoretical analysis is also indispensable. In the experimental part, the authors seem to simply take their results and compare them with some results from the literature. Numerically, their method has an advantage. However, the reasons for these advances need to be further explored.
- 5- In section conclusion, discuss the weaknesses of this model and describe your future goals and how you would extend the proposed algorithm for such problems.