

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_106144
Title of the Manuscript:	DETECTION OF FRAUDULENT HEALTH INSURANCE CLAIMS BASED ON DECISION TREE WITH PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This is not a bad paper but it is not yet at the level required for publication. At least part of the introduction is written in the future tense. The literature review should be rewritten: it should be organized according to the various themes found in the literature rather than, as it now is, simply a list of papers and a brief summary of their contents.</p> <p>The literature review should also identify gaps in research knowledge that could be addressed by the research conducted. Research conducted to find the answer to something is just market research. This is a journal for academic research and so it must make a contribution to academic knowledge. Since quantitative research is used in the paper, the research gap should be expressed in the form of research hypotheses.</p> <p>The current discussion is just a summary of the findings and so can be deleted entirely. The space saved should be used to highlight the claim to contribution to academic knowledge – which should come from the answers to the research hypotheses identified earlier.</p> <p>The recommendations provided are not really supported by the research and should be deleted. The conclusion should include the research limitations in more explicit detail.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	John Walsh
Department, University & Country	Kirk University, Thailand