

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

Mohammad Savargiv<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Qazvin Islamic Azad University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

In the article, the topic is interesting and up-to-date, however, in my opinion, some points should be observed so that the article can be accepted.

1. The structure of the introduction is not acceptable and needs to be rewritten. The challenge and motivation of the topic is not well explained.
2. The section of relate works is very weak and it is necessary that the literature of the subject under review be brought comprehensively.
3. Why are only 5 classic classifiers used in the proposed method? Was there a special reason for choosing these classifiers, or was there a special reason for not choosing other similar classifiers?
4. The title of Figure 2-3 is the flowchart of data pre-processing, while the details of the components of this figure indicate other things, this contradiction must be resolved.
5. What is the reason for section "2.3 Supervised learning types" in the article?
6. Section "3.0 Results and discussions" needs clearer explanations.
7. There is no proportion between the volume and the information provided in the abstract and conclusion, and there is a need to rewrite it.
8. Replace old references with new and more valid references.

Result: Major Revised.