

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: Feb 8, 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: Feb 11, 2017
<b>Manuscript Title: DEVELOPING A DECISION SUPPORT TESTING ALGORITHM TO DETECT SEVERITY LEVEL OF DENGUE</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN: e-1857-7431/1857-7881(Print)	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The study is carried out for developing a fuzzy decision system to detect dengue severity, and title with the study is appropriate.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The objective is clearly stated. Three approaches to meet the objective is explained in brief, and the observed results are written in the abstract.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>Only few noted. Recheck.</b>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>Developing of decision support model are explained well.</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The needed concepts are described correctly.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The summarization is well written notifying the drawback of their model developed.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The references included are appropriate according to authors study.</b>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Explain the comparative change in behavior of the ambiguous region in Fig.5 and Fig.6 with the parameters and the change in the concentration weights, and reasons for such changes.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

