

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_128065
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Artificial Intelligence Techniques for Heart Disease Prediction System
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript aims to compare different (9) machine learning algorithms for heart failure prediction. Although all the methods are well established, there appears to be some differences as far as the predictive ability goes. This manuscript could be a guide for new researchers in this field to test out different algorithms for future research and development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title might include "Machine Learning" instead of "Artificial Intelligence" and the word "system" may be omitted.	
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.	The abstract looks good	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript lacks and ignores some of the common practices (for example, no cross-validation of the results) in this domain.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references look good, but the authors can look into more comprehensive ML models for such predictive tasks and a larger dataset may aid in this case.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are many frequent typos throughout the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	There needs to be cross-validated results from the dataset and the average can be reported. Also, a 70-30 split does not make much sense and might be remove from the manuscript. It is not a comparison between test-train split and obviously, more training data will result in better results.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Adib Uz Zaman
Department, University & Country	University of Cincinnati, United States