

Mulindwa et al. demonstrated a new activation function in the Squeeze and Excitation structure of the artificial neuron network. The new activation function aimed to solve the gradient vanishing and the numerical stability of the log-sum-exp issues that limit the neuron network performance. The authors described current issues in the artificial neuron network, proposed the new activation function, and tested the new activation function in real cases. The test data could conditionally support the claim that the new activation function could improve the learning and generalization capacity of the 2D and 3D neuron networks. However, the quality of the manuscript needs to be taken good care of. Some of the details need to be addressed before the publication.

1. There are several acronyms (i.e., RNN, CNN, ELU, Resnet) in the manuscript that lack the proper introduction of their full names when they are first used.
2. On page 7, line 267, there is a typo. I believe it should be "lack".
3. For all Figures, it needs further descriptions. All the details of the Figures should be well explained in the captions below (i.e., in Figure 11, the explanation in the image is blurry), as well as the main paragraphs (i.e., the trend of Figures 7 and 8 are not explained). More importantly, there is no information of axes in the data representing figures. It is hard for the readers to know what X and Y axes stand for.
4. On page 5, the n-sigmoid function was proposed as the new activation function. It is quite abrupt to me for this proposal. Is there any specific reason for proposing this function? How is this function derived? Can the author explain these factors in detail?
5. On page 6, lines 218-220 and 222-223 are repeated.
6. On page 11, lines 408-413, the authors claim that the value of α could influence the final result. However, the improvement of the new activation function is small. In some of the cases, the total improvement is only 0.25%. What are the real influences of α ? By choosing a different α value, can the result show deterioration instead of improvement? Further discussion is needed to prove that the data supports the claim of the manuscript.