

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_101841
Title of the Manuscript:	Implementation of a Neural Network Approach for Predicting Sales Profit
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This article aims to determine the sales profit by using artificial neural network on bicycle sales data in Europe using SQL Server database. Such problems are one of the most studied topics with artificial learning algorithms today and are important. However, no significant scientific discovery is mentioned in the article. In addition, a lot of information such as how the study was carried out, which method was applied with which details, the structure of the data set and the findings/discussions were either not given or given insufficiently.</p> <p>2. The title is okay.</p> <p>3. No. The abstract does not present the article comprehensively.</p> <p>4. No. Although the article seems to be structured with typical article sections, it is far from a typical article structure. The necessary information either is not given or quite incomplete and given in a complex and messy manner. In addition, most of the information is given in irrelevant places. The sections are filled with information irrelevant to the purpose of the study.</p> <p>5. No (or insufficient) information to determine whether the article is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. Since there is little or no information about the used method and literature, it was not necessary to examine the article in this respect.</p> <p>My comments on the article are as follows:</p> <p>My general opinion is that the article is far from a standard article structure, concept and other features, and is quite incomplete and primitive in many respects. Therefore, although I would like to make a detailed review, I cannot find anything to examine in detail in the article.</p> <p>The narration is unbelievably bad. It is not clear what is being conveyed. Although the inadequacy of English is immediately apparent, the main problem is the way the authors narration rather than the English spelling.</p> <p>Conduct of the study, purpose, methods followed, findings, etc. many other things are either not mentioned at all or presented very little, in a complex and messy way.</p> <p>A significant portion of the work is presented in the form of a tutorial explaining how to implement standard database procedures such as security, table creation and relations in SQL Server. While many unnecessary things are mentioned, little or no information (e.g., details of the implementation and data) is given.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I regret that I could not find anything to examine the article in further detail. The article is incredibly incomplete in many ways.</p> <p>My advice is to rewrite the work after understanding how an article should be written, its structure, what should be presented and how it should be presented.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hakan Temiz
Department, University & Country	Artvin Coruh University, Turkiye