

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_70575
Title of the Manuscript:	Disease Diagnosis System Using Machine Learning
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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	Nothing	
Minor REVISION comments	The reviewer do not understand some sentences in this paper. For example, I cannot catch the meaning of "Machine learning algorithms create a mathematical model based on given data, known as "training data", to make predictions without explicit speculation is scheduled to perform this function". Furthermore, "According to research there are 70% peoples in India suffers from general disease and 25%of peoples face death due to early ignorance the main motive to develop this project is that a user can sit at their convenient place and have a check-up of their health the UI is designed in such a simple way that everyone can easily operate on it and can have a check-up" could be replaced with "According to research there are 70% peoples in India suffers from general disease and 25%of peoples face death due to early ignorance. The main motive to develop this project is that a user can sit at their convenient place and have a check-up of their health; the UI is designed in such a simple way that everyone can easily operate on it and can have a check-up"	
Optional/General comments	If possible, the reviewer needs the quantitative evaluation of the prediction error of the disease diagnosis system. For example, what percentage of the diagnoses given by this system is acceptable and useful, and what percentage of the diagnoses given by this system should be modified manually.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Kunio Takezawa</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Institute for Agro-Environmental Sciences, Japan</i>