

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_118177
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comprehensive Study of Sales Predictions Using Time Series Analysis: Case Study- Walmart Sales
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There exist some points of corrections in this paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representation of the work is not good and it took lot of time to understand. Authors need to re-write the whole document to manage the work-flow and to manage the look and feel so that it could be better for understanding by the reader. 2. The work should cater some latest work like a) A Sequential Ensemble Model for Photovoltaic Power Forecasting b) IoT fog-enabled multi-node centralized ecosystem for real time screening and monitoring of health information 3. Details about proposed work is very less and need to explore more. Comparison w.r.t. recent techniques is highly desired here. Explanation of graphs/results requires more. The details of performance is missing here 4. Authors should also mention the limitations of these study/theory/methods/argument. The equations with proofread or leema is not used here for evaluations. Something new can be evaluated here for upcoming researchers. Some scope for future work can be clearly mentioned here. Contributions seems like the working only. 	

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:	Nitin Goyal
Department, University & Country	Central University of Haryana, India