

Review of: "Chronic disease treatment default prediction with random sampling optimization."

Hairani Hairani

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- 1. In the introductory section, explain the gaps in previous research that have not been done, so the author proposes a sampling approach to improve the performance of machine learning methods. Not only that, but it is also necessary to justify the novelty of this research compared to previous research.
- 2. (a). In the methods section, there needs to be an explanation of the working concept of oversampling and under sampling to make it easier for the reader. (b). It is also necessary to mention the oversampling and under sampling methods used, such as in oversampling there are ROS, SMOTE methods and under sampling methods there are RUS, ENN, and Tomek Link. (c). Then display the number of classes before and after data sampling.
- 3. (a). In the results and discussion section, the author needs to explain why under sampling is better than oversampling which is supported by other research references. (b). It is better to compare the results with previous research cited in the related work section, whether the approach proposed by this research has better performance or not.
- 4. In the Conclusion there is no firm and complete discussion regarding the description of the findings or scientific study of the findings, as well as the research contribution and implications of the research results. Besides that, in the conclusion section, there is no explanation regarding the limitations of research and future work. Please fix it.

Qeios ID: KA9F8C · https://doi.org/10.32388/KA9F8C