

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript fills a key knowledge gap regarding heart diseases based research, which constitutes a substantial contribution to the scientific community. In addition to advancing our understanding, the meticulous technique and solid analysis offered have real-world implications for further study and field applications. I like this manuscript's inventiveness and clarity since it questions preconceived notions and offers fresh perspectives that may inspire more research. It is a useful addition to the literature because of its meticulous methodology and possibility for significant outcomes.	
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	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Structure needs to be improved. Discussion is missing, need to explain methodology and need to give some explanation of dataset.	
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 topic has significance in health sector, the paper has used machine techniques for the findings. This manuscript's meticulous experimental design and thorough data analysis attest to its scientific accuracy. The results are more reproducible because the authors used recognized approaches and provide a thorough, understandable explanation of their processes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	No need of double parenthesis in text citation Referencing need to be improved.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>Explanation of dataset is missing, Method and tools are not explained well</p> <p>Code needs to be evaluated as method isn't explained well.</p> <p>Enhance the conclusion and include further discussion. The article's conclusion should be concise and provide an explanation of future work.</p> <p>The topic and approach are good, need to add some more literature review to give strength to the topic. Methodology needs some more explanation.</p> <p>Table 7 on page 17 need its explanation. Dataset explanation is missing. The manuscript makes a novel and positive contribution to the health sector. By proposing a novel method, the proposed work has also effectively addressed the challenges and made a significant contribution. The research's motivation and relevance are described in detail. It is recommended for publication after some revisions.</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:	Hinna Arqam
Department, University & Country	Govt. College Lahore, Pakistan