



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_50129
Title of the Manuscript:	A model for Heart Disease Prediction using Data Mining Classification Techniques (Decision Trees, Naive Bayes, and KNN)
Type of the Article	Minireview 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	1. Kindly check on some grammar flaws especially in the introduction part	The grammar has been correction in all the part of the document.
	2. Kindly check on the proper citations in references	Have gone through the references and corrected as recommended, see the green colour highlighted
	3. Some in-text citations are not found in the references	Have corrections and now they are available in the references, highlighted in green colour i.e. references 20,22..
	4. Kindly provide a more convincing discussion on information mining	More discussions have been provided on information mining-
	5. Kindly provide a more comprehensive discussion on information mining, digging, etc	Comprehensive discussion on information mining, digging has been provide
	6. Kindly make sure that images are original or proper citation is a must	The figure 1 is from' Fayyad, Piatetsky-Shapiro, Smyth, "From Data Mining to Knowledge Discovery: An Overview", in Fayyad, Piatetsky-Shapiro, Smyth, Uthurusamy, <i>Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining</i> ,. Have also referenced the source of the figure.
	7. Figures must have a thorough discussion (please refer to Figure 1 as an example)	Discussion has been provided to figure 2
	8. Make sure that abbreviations are properly identified	Abbreviation have been identified properly highlighted in green
	9. Advisable that the discussion of how test and train data were derived after the cleaning and transformation processes.	The discussion on how the test and train data were derived after the cleaning and transformation processes in item 3.3 processing and analysis.
	10. Kindly discuss also the attributes which are relevant and irrelevant and the basis of these attributes	Have specified the attributes as required see the yellow colour highlighted
	11. Thorough discussion of decision tree as well as why use J48 over other decision tree techniques	Have discussed the decision tree and why we used decision tree over other decision tree techniques in detail. See the lighted green colour in the main document.
	12. Kindly provide additional basis and discussion for the use of Naïve	More discussion for the use of Naïve has been provide
	13. Proper format in citing formula must also be observed	Citation of formula has been provided in proper format
	14. Basis for relevant and irrelevant attributes must be specified	Have specified the attributes as required see the yellow colour highlighted
	15. Experimental result on the training data must also be presented and discuss	Explantations has been provided Under Processing and Analysis section
	16. Tables must also be discuss	Discussed
	17. Kindly check on the presentation of your graph	Have adjusted the presentation
	18. Kindly provide a more detailed discussion on how the results will be used in prediction with reference to your experimental results.	A more provide a more detailed discussion has been provided
Minor REVISION comments	1. Kindly check on the abstract: "like hood", sex age ... 2. Kindly check on " 740 Records..." 3. Justification of document must also be considered	1. Have corrected in the abstract, it's now reading likelihood. I have also separated sex age by commas. 2. It was supposed to be Record sets, have changed 3. Have done justification for the whole document
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)	There are NO ethical issues since the data that is used are publicly available/ obtained from Cleveland, Hungary, Switzerland VA Long Beach Databases: http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Heart+Disease and are is well referenced in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>