

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_97396
Title of the Manuscript:	Forecasting the risk factors of COVID-19 through AI feature fitting learning process (FfitL-CoV19)
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In this manuscript, the authors developed an automated screening system based on an AI technique for predicting the risk factors of COVID-19. This manuscript is up to date with the current trends and issues. - The title of the manuscript is suitable. - The abstract is suitable for a scientific manuscript. Maybe the authors can add some results in the abstract to give an overview to the readers. - The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. - The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, some improvements need to be added to the manuscript, thus the readers can understand the proposed automated system. - The number of references is sufficient and recent. However, some citations need to be added in the 'Previous Work' section. - Perhaps the authors can add some statistics related to COVID-19 disease to show the seriousness of developing an automated screening system. - In the first paragraph of the 'Previous Work' section, the authors mentioned several previous methods related to automated COV-19 screening. Please cite all the methods. - The discussion in the 'Previous Work' section is too short. Since the authors did not mention the performance of the previous studies, it is difficult to find the gap in the manuscript. As for the suggestion, the authors can add some remarks or state the limitation of the previous studies and highlight the gap of the proposed system. - In Figure 1, the authors can provide a summary of what happens in each stage/ block diagram. - Please state from where the authors acquired the scanned images. It is publicly available or obtained from the hospitals? In addition, please state the description related to the scanned images such as the dimension of the image and the format of the image. - Please explain more of what happened in the feature fitting analysis stage. - Please explain why the authors select the SVM as a classifier for this study. - In the image processing technique stage, are any improvements made to the scanned image such as an image enhancement technique or filtering technique to remove the noise? - It is better for the authors to provide a general discussion for Figure 2. Maybe the authors can compare the healthy and infected person from the CT and X-ray images. - Perhaps the authors can describe the limitation of the proposed system for future study. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are some grammatical errors in this manuscript. Please fix it. - Spelling error - DensNet or DenseNet? - Maybe the authors can select the important keywords that are related to this study because it seems the stated keywords are excessive. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall, some improvements can be made as provided in the suggested 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fahmi Akmal Bin Dzul kifli
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Malaysia