



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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kindly check on some grammar flaws especially in the introduction part 2. Kindly check on the proper citations in references 3. Some in-text citations are not found in the references 4. Kindly provide a more convincing discussion on information mining 5. Kindly provide a more comprehensive discussion on information mining, digging, etc 6. Kindly make sure that images are original or proper citation is a must 7. Figures must have a thorough discussion (please refer to Figure 1 as an example) 8. Make sure that abbreviations are properly identified 9. Advisable that the discussion of how test and train data were derived after the cleaning and transformation processes. 10. Kindly discuss also the attributes which are relevant and irrelevant and the basis of these attributes 11. Thorough discussion of decision tree as well as why use J48 over other decision tree techniques 12. Kindly provide additional basis and discussion for the use of Naïve 13. Proper format in citing formula must also be observed 14. Basis for relevant and irrelevant attributes must be specified 15. Experimental result on the training data must also be presented and discuss 16. Tables must also be discuss 17. Kindly check on the presentation of your graph 18. Kindly provide a more detailed discussion on how the results will be used in prediction with reference to your experimental results. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kindly check on the abstract: "like hood", sex age ... 2. Kindly check on " 740 Records..." 3. Justification of document must also be considered 	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sheila Abaya
Department, University & Country	University of the East , Philippines