



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_45438
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE PREDICTION USING CLASSIFICATION ALGORITHMS
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Line 12 and 13: By applying the ID3 (Iterative Dichotomiser 3) and C4.5 classification algorithms was applied on the data to predict the academic performance of students in future examinations Recast this sentence to make meaning.</p> <p>2. The author(s) uses CSE (Council of Science Editor) style of citation/reference listing. See [1] and [2] and many others are not properly listed. Author(s) should see the CSE manual to make corrections to the reference listing, particularly, he should use this Journal's method of citation/reference listing</p> <p>3. Two different decision tree algorithms (ID3 and C4.5 algorithms) were applied after to predict the future performance of the student using the dataset. Recast this sentence to make meaning.</p> <p>4. In this regard, the data of students enrolled in 2008/2009 academic session of Joseph Ayo Babalola 29 University was obtained and used in this study. Author(s) should use a more recent data instead of 2008/2009 (too old data).</p> <p>5. Line 36 and 37: These are some of the related work that describes data mining and knowledge discovery in the context of this work. Recast this sentence to make meaning.</p> <p>6. Lines 80, 81, 82 and 83. Apart from the age of the data used, the size of 100 records from 6 departments is sufficient for good analysis of this kind of study.</p> <p>7. Line 101: variable, $i = 1$ to i; check this expression for correctness.</p> <p>8. Lines 109 to 112 statement is grammatically wrong. It should be recast.</p>	<p>1. Noted. It has been corrected in the updated version of the manuscript.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3. Noted. It has been corrected in the updated version of the manuscript.</p> <p>4. The students gained admission in 2008/2009 session. The students sent 4 to five years in the university after which they graduated and the final result was also one of the attributes used in the prediction. That was the dataset we can get for now.</p> <p>5. Noted and taken care of in the updated manuscript.</p> <p>6. That is the ones we can gather. Though it is small but it is not too small for data mining task.</p> <p>7. Noted and corrected. It ought to be variable $i = 1$ to j</p> <p>8. Corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. There are too many grammatical errors in the paper. The author(s) should make corrections and submit the paper for proofreading before sending it to the Journal.</p>	Noted and corrected.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	