

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_118531
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing DAE Training Efficiency for Missing Data Imputation via Input Data Recombination
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Missing data is a common issue in many fields, what are the innovative methods for handling DAE? It would be a significant contribution. This is especially true if existing methods have any notable limitations to find the efficiency or accuracy. If the method can be adapted or extended to other types of neural networks or data imputation problems, its impact will same or any changes will occur.</p> <p>The current title is suitable and clearly conveys the main focus of the research.</p> <p>Yes, it clearly states the problem of missing data and the significance of improving DAE training efficiency.</p> <p>The appropriateness of subsections and structure in a manuscript is crucial for clarity, readability, and comprehensiveness. significant improvements in training time and data recovery performance compared to traditional DAE training methods are clearly addressed.</p> <p>Are the results interpreted correctly in the context of the hypothesis and research questions? Does the discussion compare the findings with previous research appropriately? Are the limitations of the study acknowledged and discussed?</p> <p>The Manuscript references are sufficient and appropriate.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Grammatical corrections related to the English language is needed.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Some minor revisions paper may accept.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Bhavani Sankar Panda
Department, University & Country	Raghu Engineering College, India