

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_102894
Title of the Manuscript:	Dengue Cases Prediction Using Time Series Forecasting Models
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The findings of this article have made a significant contribution to the body of knowledge because the numerical analysis demonstrates the comparison of two methods.</p> <p>The title should be more specific on the method use. "Predicting Dengue Outbreaks in Cagayan de Oro, Philippines using Facebook Prophets and the ARIMA Model for Time Series Forecasting"</p> <p>The abstract should be concise and condensed, including an introduction, method, results, and conclusion.</p> <p>This article compares two different methodologies. The author has detailed every piece of evidence that supports their findings. I had hoped, however, for a more elaborate conclusion.</p> <p>The author have provide all the evidence towards their findings in detail. However I expecting more convincing on their conclusion regarding on their result.</p> <p>The reference list should be formatted correctly. Only fifty percent of the references are from the past five years.</p> <p>I discovered that there are a number of formatting errors. Before resubmitting the article, could you please check to see that the author has followed the formatting guideline?</p> <p>Would it be possible to put the algorithm flow chart in this article?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable for academic communication because it is moderate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please check to see that the format for the figure, table, and list of references follows the requirements provided by the publisher.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Shahimi Bin Ariffin
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi Mara, Malaysia