Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_53953**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF HEALTH CARE ONTOLOGY**
Type of the Article	**Review 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)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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. In "DATA SOURCES AND SEARCH STRATEGY" and "STUDY SELECTION" • The approach, design and methods are appropriate to respond to the question research. However, the manuscript requires a better description of the activities performed and clarification of the methodological choices made. It is **necessary a better clarification of the Boolean language construction and how was applied**. • It is not clear the criteria for selecting the actual papers to be included. It will be interesting to present a "Flow Diagram" with the information through the different phases of a systematic review (maps out the number of records identified, included and excluded, and the reasons for exclusions).	I agree that the approach, design and methods are appropriate to respond to the question research. The description of the activities performed and clarification of the methodological choices made were clearly narrated under DATA SOURCES AND SEARCH STRATEGY and Search Selection session of the report. The AND operator was used since the review work was purely on use Ontology in the Health care. This is reflected in the search strings used: "Ontology and Health Care" Health Ontology and Diagnosis System In selecting the actual papers to be included, a manual review of eligible publication was carried out. The total number of articles not selected were not considered at all but the reasons for their exclusion is clearly stated in the report.
Minor REVISION comments	This manuscript needs some minor revision to a well-defined methodology to identify, analyses and interpret all available evidence related to the specifics research questions in a way to be unbiased: 2. In the "ABSTRACT", it is necessary to refer that the study use a specific protocol (xxxxxx) that describes the conduct of a proposed systematic literature review. It is also necessary to refer criteria for the construction of the Boolean phrase. 3. In "DATA EXTRACTION AND SYNTHESIS": • It will be easier to present the results of each article to present by a table. I think that the core aspects referenced in the results of the studies can be presented in table (Summary of contributions and approaches considered). By this way, more synthesis and organization of the information conveyed by the different articles would be possible. 4. In "RESULT AND DISCUSSION": • It will be necessary to summarize the main contributions and to discuss these results. 5. In "CONCLUSION": • The findings generally point to the central contributions of the review and the limitations identified in the different studies. Final considerations should include a summary of the general aspects of the development of health ontologies addressed by the different studies selected.	The specific protocol has been clearly stated in the abstract as suggested and highlighted . The criteria for the construction of the Boolean phrase has been included in the abstract and highlighted. For the comments on result and discussion , this can be found in the second and third paragraph of the session. And for the comment on the conclusion , some corrections has been effected as suggested. The results were presented as a tables
Optional/General comments	The topic of this manuscript is interesting for our readership and "contribute to the development and advancement of scientific knowledge on health ontologies". This manuscript is a systematic literature review with meta-syntheses. The study is well delineated and the text is well structured. The text allows the global transmission of ideas. The study contributes with knowledge to the construction of evidence in the domains of heath ontologies. The background (INTRODUCTION) to support ontological structures is very succinct, but assertive in relation to the object of study.	

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