

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_120837
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Machine Learning Algorithms in Predicting Financial Market Movements
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents various models for estimating economic indicators, such as the ARIMA model, the LSTM model, the Naive Bayes algorithm, regression models, and more. However, this may be unnecessary, as researchers typically already know how to choose a suitable model for their research objectives. Furthermore, comparing the results of these models may not have scientific merit, as each model has its own unique characteristics and application methods based on specific data and objectives. It is therefore difficult to declare one model superior to another.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No, because the abstract is unclear about the purpose, methodology, results, and suggestions. Structure of the Abstract: Follow the IMRaD structure (commonly used in scientific papers): Introduction: Briefly state the problem or issue. Methods: Describe the research design and data collection methods. Results: Summarize the major findings. Discussion: Highlight the conclusions drawn from the results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, because the basic structure of Research Article includes an Introduction, Literature review, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The introduction of the manuscript needs to include important elements such as purpose, methodology, motivation, and highlights. It seems to be primarily based on the existing literature but does not sufficiently identify the research gap and hypotheses that will be applied to the manuscript. Moreover, the methodology section is inadequate as it lacks a relevant model. Addressing these issues is essential to enhance the overall quality of the manuscript and to strengthen its arguments.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	A scientific article should have more references than the 18 provided in this paper.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comment		

Review Form 3

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:	Doan Van Dinh
Department, University & Country	Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam