

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_120451
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comprehensive Exploration of Hidden Markov Models and Their Diverse Applications
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://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 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.	The writing is not new, but it is illustrative of the HMM models, which have been very well accepted especially in the field of artificial intelligence and the area of finance. It is necessary to be very careful with the graphics, they are very bad in format, they must improve them. In the writing of the equations, they should check that they really look like subscripts, be very careful with their format. It is a very simple article but not for that reason it should not lack importance for some other people who are just beginning to know about the HMM, it is as if it were an introduction of the importance of the same ones.	
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 addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	For the scope and objective with which the article was developed, it is sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, some typing errors in English (check the use of a and and).	
Optional/General comments	The Ms_JSRR-120451 file is not allowed to be modified, so only the main errors are marked. Validate the editing format well because of the spaces. Figure 1. Should not cross lines over what is written. Figure 2. Is very bad, all embedded on the data graph, etc. Figure 3. Same observation should be more fine-grained in its representation. Figure 4. Same remark, plus what should be the format of the graph description: above it or below it? Here it appears at the top. Some equations the subindices appear at the same level of the normal letter. Figure 5. The reality of these graphs is observed, they are pasted from others, i.e., image superimposed on the other image, very bad.	

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:	Ernesto Cervantes López
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Statistics and Geography, Aguascalientes, México