



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_CA_17792
Title of the Manuscript:	Learning Bayesian Networks using Heart Failure Data
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>)



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	The focus of the paper was to describe and derive conditional independence relations existing among random variables through the directed conditional model or the Bayesian networks: - Line 3 in the abstract read....works that encodes....should be corrected to ...works that encode..... - Abstract, in the result section last line . Age did not to have.....correct to, Age did not have.... - To me the introduction is well written and quite interesting. However, the first paragraph should be referenced to avoid a trap of plagiarism. - In the method section Table 1 should be mentioned in the text, it could be done by referring to it at the end of Independent variables (i.e. see Table 1) - Several text books and research papers document considerable amounts of literature on Bayesian Networks. However, the authors only chose to cite 2 proceeding, I find this un realistic and a violation of other people's right to be cited. I suggest that authors add more references to this section Bayesian Networks. - In section 2.1, line 9, it should be emphasized that V is as well a nonempty set of nodes. - Line 15, section 2.1, the X, denotes a vector I suggest it should be corrected to X. - In section 2.1.1, you talk of \theta before introducing the equation in which it is contained, I	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	suggest that you cite the equation at that point when you conclude sentence2, line 3, just before (cite) ie.learn..... • Paragraph 2 in section3 is a repetition of what has already been discussed i.e. the definition and use of Bayesian networks. I suggest that it be removed. • In paragraph 4 section 3, on the last line is to handle Death as a continuous.....should be corrected to handle death as ... • In section 3 under specification of Bayesian Network: The author should clearly explain what is going on, the software used. I would have expected the author to point out that, say “the R-code for computing.....is presented” but nothing to that effect which leaves the reader wondering on what is going on!!!! That must be put right	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• Proper citation to throughout the manuscript should be encouraged. • The results seem to be accurate but they could be supported by say other studies if the authors had read enough literature on the use of Bayesian Networks in clinical studies and references provided. • Conclusions are wanting as this does not seem to be a new technique, I don't see any justification • In the conclusion line 3 the hyphen in the word technique should be removed. • This seems to be a review paper since it points out the performance of the Bayesian Networks on say new data.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cliff Richard Kikawa
Department, University & Country	Mathematics and Statistics, Tshwane University of Technology, Republic of South Africa