



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-57267**

Title: **Advanced Piezoelectric Sensors Integrated with AI for Real-Time Medical Imaging**

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision ...✓.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			✓	
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer's ID: JPR- **098**

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Decision: Accept after Major Revision

1. Summary of the Paper

The manuscript titled “*Advanced Piezoelectric Sensors Integrated with AI for Real-Time Medical Imaging*” presents a review-style discussion on the integration of piezoelectric sensors with artificial intelligence (AI) for real-time medical imaging applications. It covers materials, sensing mechanisms, AI techniques, applications, and challenges.

2. Overall Assessment

The topic is **relevant and interdisciplinary**, combining biomedical engineering, materials science, and AI. However, the manuscript is largely **descriptive**, lacks technical depth, and does not provide sufficient novelty or critical analysis expected for a high-quality research or review article.

3. Strengths

- Addresses a **timely and important research area** (AI + medical imaging).
- Covers a **broad range of concepts**, including materials, AI models, and applications.
- Includes recent references (up to 2025–2026).
- Highlights **challenges and future directions**.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. Major Revisions

1. Lack of Clear Contribution

The manuscript reads as a general overview without a clear research contribution or novel insight.

2. Absence of Systematic Review Methodology

No structured review framework, selection criteria, or classification methodology is provided.

3. Limited Technical Depth

AI models (CNN, RNN, etc.) are mentioned but not explained in sufficient technical detail.

4. No Quantitative Analysis

The paper lacks comparative tables, performance metrics, or quantitative evaluation of methods.

5. Weak Critical Analysis

Literature is summarized but not critically analyzed or compared.

6. Poor Writing Quality

Numerous grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and repetition reduce readability.

7. Formatting and Structural Issues

- Improper keyword section (“00000000000000”)
- Inconsistent formatting and section organization

8. Lack of Figures/Tables for Clarity

No meaningful diagrams, tables, or frameworks to summarize concepts.

5. Minor Revisions

- Redundant explanations in introduction and discussion
- Inconsistent terminology
- Weak transitions between sections
- References need formatting consistency
- Some statements are overly generalized without citation support

6. Suggestions for Improvement

- Clearly define the **type of paper** (review vs research)
- Add **systematic review methodology**
- Include **comparative tables and figures**
- Improve **technical depth and critical discussion**
- Revise language thoroughly for academic quality