

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 <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.	The article has major weaknesses: 1-The Abstract, Introduction sections should clearly show how this review differs from previous reviews. 2-There is no novelty in the first sections. 3-The paper must present more comparisons of the functionalities, data types, different technologies used in HMM applications discussed. 4- The authors should focus on new areas of HMM application (new applications, new challenges with big data, new perspectives...) to show the novelty of their paper, and not reproduce (uncritically) other work discussed by many researchers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title requires improvement.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	1-The abstract should be written in a more professional style to define the purpose and novelties of this work. Authors should make brief reference to some of the new ideas brought about by this work at the end of the abstract. 2- Keywords: We suggest that the authors should eliminate some keywords. It is preferable that they replace them with other words in order to expand the reach of the search.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1-There is no novelty in the first sections. 2-The Introduction section is not organized. The introduction is too long and does not appropriately present the topic. 3-It is essential to review the formulas used and correct any errors (example: 2. Definitions and examples: 2.1. Markov chain: confusion between n and t !!!) 4-Where is section 3 ??? 5-The conclusion section is incomplete and requires improvement. The authors should carefully state their conclusion from this study.	
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.	Overall, the paper is not very convincing and needs to be thoroughly revised to address several major concerns.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	1-Many paragraphs have no reference 2-The authors should update the list of references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	This research requires proofreading of the entirety of the research to eliminate all the issues related to spelling, typos and grammar mistakes. In addition, this research is very long, the authors should reduce the volume of the search significantly by removing unnecessary sentences and paragraphs.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the paper is not that complete and needs major revision to address several major concerns.	

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:	Imad Sassi
Department, University & Country	Hassan II University of Casablanca, Morocco