

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_97770
Title of the Manuscript:	Early Parkinson's disease detection using by Machine Learning Approach
Type of the Article	Descriptive

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:

(<https://www.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1)The manuscript primary objective to use a machine learning model for the detection of Parkinson's disease and proposal is that the model will be trained on a public repository dataset of biomedical voice measurements from individuals with and without Parkinson's disease. And thus this gives the validity of being important for scientific community.</p> <p>2) Yes, the title is suitable, but could have been more specific. Right now, with the study undertaken.</p> <p>3) The abstract is apt and elaborate.</p> <p>4) Structure is good and subsections can have implications.</p> <p>5) Yes, it is scientifically correct</p> <p>6) References are sufficient but needs attention as some of the references are incomplete.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It does fall into the category of scholarly communication	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leena N. Fukey
Department, University & Country	School of Business and Management, Christ University, India