

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_120766</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Novel Approach to the Moving Average Distance and Isolation Forest Method for Forecasting Financial Time Series Data</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It offers new insights and data that can inspire further research and applications	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes its suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract seems to closely mirror a previous publication. Please ensure originality	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes but Please ensure that the discussion directly addresses the research objectives outlined in the introduction	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The methodology section is well-described, but some of the language is overly similar to existing methodologies. Please rephrase to ensure originality.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes its includes recent years too	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	Please provide more detailed explanations for the results presented in this section.	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saranya.N
Department, University & Country	Dr.N.G.P.Institute of Technology, India