

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_97936
Title of the Manuscript:	LOCATION-BASED HOUSE PREDICTION USING DATA SCIENCE TECHNIQUES
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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>1 – Adequate</p> <p>2 – Make the adjustment indicated in the general comments</p> <p>3 – Make the adjustment indicated in the general comments</p> <p>4 – Adequate</p> <p>5 – Adequate</p> <p>6 - Adequate</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1 - Make the adjustment indicated in the general comments</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>An article with an interesting topic and approach It is necessary to correct: Better define regionality in the title, to make it clear to the author that even though it is a study with data science, the result is regionalized In the abstract, make clear the contribution of the article, as well as the main results found. Still in the summary, indicate the location of the country to the reader, even though it is obvious that it is India by the indicated state, depending on the methodological approach, researchers from other parts of the world may not know where Telangana is Remove Figure 1, has no practical purpose within the text of the section Avoid using "we" in scientific text, the more impersonal the better Adjust the size of the Figures that represent the Graphs in the results. Apparently, if you increase the values they will blur, so you need to redo them Figure 9 got cropped, redo Correct references, journal standards were not followed Grammar review</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:	Rodrigo Monteiro da Silva
Department, University & Country	State University of Paraná, Brazil