

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_123245
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction of Heart Disease Risk among Patients in Federal Medical Centre, Abeokuta using Naïve Bayes
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is comprehensive. There is no denying its significance and application, especially in the field of medicine. Being able to predict patients' heart disease using a mathematical model will have a significant impact on the community, potentially advancing prevention or reducing the risk of heart disease among patients. Additionally, the study will provide future researchers with opportunities to further explore prediction modeling in the medical field, thereby benefiting the public.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes. The study's abstract already outlines the key components.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It seem to be appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study's procedures are comprehensively executed in the paper. The model's application and the rationale for its necessity in predicting the risk of heart disease were thoroughly discussed. The significance and its relevance to the field of study were thoroughly examined.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes. The study presented and cited adequate and recent references	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Appropriate language usage is being observed in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The paper is in great potential for publication	

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:	Eduardo Edu C. Cornillez
Department, University & Country	Eastern Visayas State University, Philippines