

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_101464</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Predicting Power Outages and Detecting Faults: Unleashing the Power of Deep Learning Algorithms</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes, very important</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>No</b> , in the abstract complete with purpose, materials and methods, results and conclusions  <b>in the manuscript should contain methods, data, results and discussion</b>  <b>not true</b>  <b>quite recent references</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	good	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	there should be data to compare that the proposed method is better than the former	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anak Agung Ngurah Gunawan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Udayana, Indonesia</b>