EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute ESI
10 YEARS

Paper: **"A Machine Learning and Computer Vision Application to Robustly Extract Winnings from Multiple Lottery Tickets in One Shot"**

Submitted: 21 September 2022
Accepted: 30 May 2023
Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: Wan Li

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n33p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Pietro Braione
University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

Reviewer 2: Diana Yankovich
Delaware State University, Dover DE, USA

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: Sep 29, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: Oct 19, 2022
Manuscript Title: A Machine Learning and Computer Vision Application to Robustly Extract Winnings from Multiple Lottery Tickets in One Shot	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**

(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
The technique is explained clearly, but there is no clear indication of how (and if) the ability of the proposed approach to correctly recognize the ticket images was evaluated quantitatively	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**2**
There is not a comprehensive experimentation of the proposed approach, only a couple of examples, so it is not possible to evaluate quantitatively the ability of the proposed technique to perform the task correctly	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2**
Since a quantitative experimentation is missing, and an implementation on smartphone is also missing, the conclusions (i.e., that an app based on the proposed technique will be successful) are hardly supported by the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is missing an experimental assessment that determines whether the proposed approach is sufficiently precise and robust to noise, rotation and deformation of images. Moreover, it would be necessary an experimentation on a smartphone platform to determine whether the approach is suitable to be integrated within an app, or at least discuss how the most complex calculations can be offloaded to a cloud server while maintaining the privacy of the user's lottery ticket data.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Diana Yankovich	
University/Country: Delaware State University, Dover DE, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: Feb the 1st 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: Mar the 12th 2023
Manuscript Title: A Machine Learning and Computer Vision Application to Robustly Extract Winnings from Multiple Lottery Tickets in *One Shot*	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1024/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**

The title is very clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
There are no grammatical or spelling errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The study methods are explained clearly.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	**Y**
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Great practical application. Go on, create a mobile app for usage on any phone. I believe that it will be worth it.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: *Strongly recommending the article for publication.*