



Pratya Nuankaew <nuankaew.p@gmail.com>

[JADS] #881 - Round 1 Review Decision

1 message

JADS Editor <editor@bright-journal.org>

Fri, Jun 27, 2025 at 7:43 PM

To: pratya.nu@up.ac.th, 65020788@up.ac.th, 65020799@up.ac.th, 65025389@up.ac.th, wongpanya.nu@up.ac.th



Dear Dr. Pratya Nuankaew,

We are writing to inform you that your paper, entitled "**AI-Driven Mobile Application for Self-Monitoring Personalized Premenstrual Symptoms and Risk Assessment of Depressive Crises in Female University Students**" submitted with the identification number **#881**, has successfully completed a rigorous double-blind review process by the esteemed Journal of Applied Data Sciences (JADS) Peer Review. Please accept our sincere appreciation for your contribution to the field of data sciences through your submission. We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript is **Revision Required**. To facilitate this process, we kindly request that you carefully review the comments and suggestions provided by the reviewers. You are given a period of **7 days to finalize the revisions (otherwise your submission will be archived)** and ensure that the concerns raised are adequately addressed. The successful completion of these revisions will greatly contribute to the editorial decision-making process.

Upon receipt of your revised paper, our team will require approximately 2-7 days to thoroughly assess the modifications made. Subsequently, you will be promptly notified of the next decision regarding your manuscript. We advise you to focus on verifying the accuracy of metadata and ensuring the completeness of the revisions in order to minimize the likelihood of re-entering the review stage. We would like to extend our gratitude once again for choosing the Journal of Applied Data Sciences (JADS) as the venue for your scholarly work. Should you require any assistance or guidance during the revision or resubmission process, please do not hesitate to reach out to us. Our team is dedicated to providing the necessary support to facilitate a smooth and successful publication experience for you.

Thank you for your cooperation, and we look forward to the potential publication of your paper in the Journal of Applied Data Sciences (JADS).

Sincerely,

Ibrahiem M. M. El Emary
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Applied Data Sciences (JADS)
Email: editor@bright-journal.org

----- - IMPORTANT - -----

----- - Content Writing - -----

Abstract: Please craft a concise abstract within a 250 to 300 word limit. Summarize the contributions, ideas, findings, or results of your paper and discuss their implications. Do not include abbreviations, footnotes, references, mathematical equations, diagrams, or tables. We suggest structuring your abstract as follows:

1. Clearly state the primary objective of your paper.
2. Highlight the virtues or contributions of your research.
3. Provide a conceptual description of your methodology.
4. Describe the research figure, tables and procedures employed, such as simulation, experimentation, or survey methods.
5. If the figure or table is in a non-English language, please provide a translated version of the table or a detailed explanation.
6. Present the main outcomes or results of your study, along with any relevant conclusions.
7. If applicable, discuss the implications of your findings for future research or practical applications.

Please note that this journal exclusively publishes high-quality papers. A high-quality paper should include the following elements:

1. A well-defined statement of the problem being addressed.
2. Proposed solution(s) to the problem.
3. Obtained results, accompanied by a clear description of any previous work on the topic and the novelty of your research.

Ensure that your discussion section is appropriate. In the "Results and Discussion" section, emphasize the most significant findings and provide a thorough analysis of the results.

The title of your paper should succinctly summarize the main ideas of your study. It should serve as a comprehensive and descriptive representation of your research. Use abbreviations and acronyms sparingly unless they are widely recognized.

SUBMISSION: #881

TITLE: AI-Driven Mobile Application for Self-Monitoring Personalized Premenstrual Symptoms and Risk Assessment of Depressive Crises in Female University Students

----- REVIEW 1 -----

----- Overall evaluation -----

Decision: Revision Required

----- Comment:

After conducting an in-depth evaluation of this manuscript, I have identified several areas that could be strengthened. The feedback I provide aims to improve the clarity of the arguments, the consistency of the data, and the relevance of the research findings to the established theoretical framework.

The term "depressive crisis" is used in the title and throughout the document but is not clearly defined—whether it refers to a clinical major depressive episode or a specific term adopted by the authors.

In the abstract, the claim that the application has "clinical relevance" lacks supporting evidence or clinical validation data.

There is no detailed explanation of how the AI algorithms were trained, including preprocessing steps or handling of missing, imbalanced, or noisy data.

The mixed-methods framework is not methodologically clarified—such as the number of interviews conducted or how qualitative and quantitative data were integrated.

Model validation is only described using 10-fold cross-validation without discussing potential overfitting or underfitting issues.

The rationale for selecting SVM and Logistic Regression as baseline models is not explicitly provided—there is no justification for their relevance to this specific dataset.

----- REVIEW 2 -----

----- Overall evaluation -----

Decision: Revision Required

----- Comment:

To refine this manuscript, I have conducted a critical analysis of each section. The suggestions I offer are intended to help the author present the research findings more comprehensively and convincingly to the readership.

The claim that SVM achieved perfect accuracy (100%) for anxiety prediction is highly suspect and likely indicates overfitting; such performance is extremely rare and requires critical scrutiny.

Although the questionnaire development includes expert validation and IOC analysis, there is no mention of internal consistency measures such as Cronbach's alpha or construct validity tests.

The discussion of PMS and PMDD model performance does not differentiate the potential consequences of misclassification between these two clinically distinct conditions.

The document lacks visualizations (e.g., ROC curves, confusion matrices), which limits readers' ability to evaluate model performance visually.

Although the number of collected responses exceeded the target sample, there is no discussion on how this affects sampling balance or potential biases in representation.

UML diagrams are mentioned as design tools but are not included in the document, reducing transparency in system architecture and user interaction modeling.

----- REVIEW 3 -----

----- Overall evaluation -----

Decision: Revision Required

----- Comment:

This evaluation shows that the manuscript holds significant potential. However, there are still aspects that need improvement to reach optimal quality. The feedback I provide is meant to serve as a guide for the author in making revisions.

UML diagrams are mentioned as design tools but are not included in the document, reducing transparency in system architecture and user interaction modeling.

It is unclear whether the mobile application was tested in a clinical setting or only evaluated internally without external validation or deployment trials.

Statements like “clinical utility” and “scalable mental health support tool” are speculative and not backed by longitudinal studies or real-world deployment data.

The term “AI-driven feedback” is used vaguely; it is unclear whether the feedback is given via text, visual dashboards, or push notifications.

While the user-centered design (UCD) approach is mentioned, no concrete usability metrics (e.g., System Usability Scale scores) or quantitative evaluations are presented.

The section on respondents' sexual experiences is presented without any discussion of ethical considerations, sensitivity protocols, or participant protection strategies.

The references are cited numerically (e.g., [xx]) but the actual reference list is missing, making it impossible to verify the sources or assess the quality of cited literature.



JADS Response-to-Reviewers Template.docx

18K