SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_52431**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Expert system based on rules and medical knowledge for the medical diagnosis of typhoid fever (XperTyph)**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. From the abstract, delete one "shortage" from the sentence "In addition, due to the shortage and shortage of doctors…" 2. The sentence "Implemented an Expert XperTyph system…" is implemented, does not explain anything. 3. The abstract introduced the topic but the methods used and results gotten were not presented. 4. The references are not recent, the most recent one is 2012. Also authors should add a more relevant reference. 5. Under Diseases Considered section, Typhoid fever sub heading was repeated, try to merge it. 6. Authors should give more explanation on the table 7. Literature review should come before Methodology. 8. The methodology does not explain how the rules were generated and the programming tools used. 9. Authors should explain how the system was tested and how does it perform with the experts' diagnosis.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Performance metrics could be included such as True Positive (TP), True Negative (TN), False Positive (FP), False Negative (FN), Sensitivity, Specificity, Accuracy. 2. Test results from the system and experts' result can also be included for comparison. 3. Authors can also include the number of people tested from the results.	
Optional/General comments	1. Authors should check the journal website to see the journal format and update accordingly. 2. The write up looks like a thesis, authors should go through and correct using the journal format. 3. Recent works can be consulted and added to the references section.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

<mark>PART 2:</mark>

	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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Oladele, Matthias Omotayo*
Department, University & Country	*The Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria*