

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJRCOS_99986   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Development of a COVID-19 Patients' Fatality Prediction System Using Swarm Intelligent Convolution Neural Network |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research 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:

(<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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>Generally, the study meets the overall requirements of scientific research. The researchers were able to logically present arguments, critique their arguments, and validate all the perspectives on the discussed issues. The methodology was clear and systematic, and it is objectively defined and conducted. The findings were accurately presented and interpretations were meaningful and succinctly presented for the viewer to read. This allowed for a robust discussion on the matter that was already outlined in all the previous sections.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>Yes (I made some corrections to the language to enhance the quality of the grammar).</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>Many grammatical changes to the document to improve the quality of the paper. This paper will add value to the literature, and I recommend it for publication</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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Paul Andrew Bourne</b>                     |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Northern Caribbean University, Jamaica</b> |