

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_127645
Title of the Manuscript:	LSTM-GNN Synergy: A New Frontier in Stock Price Prediction
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 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 paper is about hybrid integration between LSTM and GNN, but the explanation of this section is very lacking. How is the integration architecture?, How to integrate?. Need more explanation about the proposed method. Is it just the output of LSTM and GNN averaged or the architecture is combined. If the hybrid is just the output of LSTM and GNN averaged, then this article is still very shallow, needs to be improved.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title seems appropriate, but this article has not yet seen significant contributions. After the contribution is clean and clear, we will provide more in-depth suggestions according to the proposal.	
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.	The problem (object) is still very shallow, need to be more specific why this LSTM and GNN integration is needed. The methodology is still not specific enough to the main contribution, show your main contribution here. The results show your success rate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The methodology is still unclear, clarify your contribution method. how is the architecture, how are the steps, how is the architectural design. The results are adjusted to your research method (steps), this is so that each step you take is clearly visible. The results need to be compared with current research, because the discussion needs this. The discussion must discuss existing research, then what is the effect on your research proposal.	
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.	This manuscript is still very lacking, because the core contribution is not explained cleanly and clearly. Comparison with previous research is also lacking. The steps are still unclear, and the explanation of the results of each step is also lacking.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Total references of all 17 articles. references from 2020 and below are 6 articles. then there are only 11 new articles. this is still very lacking for a scientific paper. minimum 30 articles for a research paper.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the article is suitable for scientific communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Arif Mudi Priyatno
Department, University & Country	Universitas Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai, Indonesia