

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_106546
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study of Bitcoin's Price Prediction Using Regression Algorithms
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Researches involving bitcoin is relevant in the current atmosphere.</p> <p>2. A Comparative Study of Bitcoin's Price Prediction Using Regression Models</p> <p>3. Many typographical errors and grammatical blunders are observed in the ABSTRACT section. This should be addressed.</p> <p>4. The sections and subsections are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically okay.</p> <p>6. Although the author provided relevant references, the work will be more appreciated if few more recent trends in bitcoin prediction and mining are introduced.</p> <p>It seems the authors hurriedly prepared the manuscript. The author is advised to carefully revisit every lines and pages of the manuscripts. There are no Discussion and Conclusion sections. These are essential for overview of all results and findings in the research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of grammar used in the article is not suitable for scholarly qualification in its present form.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author may utilize the help of specialists or used online grammar editors like GRAMMARLY in order to improve the quality of the language.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adetunji, Ademola Abiodun
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria