

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>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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, it is important for the scientific community. Yes, it is suitable Yes, comprehensive. Satisfactory. In Page#12, figure 2, Decision symbol did not mention the True and False options. It must be mentioned clearly. References are satisfied. Reference #29, year of publishing wrongly marked. It should be corrected. Reference#44 is cited in the article page #22 under last paragraph of "Discussion of Results" but, there is no reference with #44. IT should be checked and corrected. Suggested to include future enhancements to support the future researchers after conclusion part. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Language usage is satisfactory. All the paragraphs must begin with some Indentation. It's missing in all the paragraph. Suggested to included indentation for each paragraph. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Appreciated the authors for their innovative idea and preparation of this article. I believe that this paper can be published after updating the above mentioned compulsory / Minor recommendations.	

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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rajasekaran S
Department, University & Country	College of Computing and Information Sciences, University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Oman