

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_112710
Title of the Manuscript:	Detecting Change in a Volatile Curve United State Stock Market (US SM) with the use of Automated Decomposition for Time Series Components.
Type of the 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>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1) The research idea is of importance, but it is not appropriately handled in this manuscript. The whole introduction, methodology, analysis, discussion, and conclusion are somewhat copy pasted and are not properly discussed. Even the results of empirical analysis are not clearly written. It is claimed that the methodological modification is suggested by the authors, but it does not seem so from the methodological section.</p> <p>2) No, the concept of volatility is not discussed at all in the article. cyclical variation, random variation and the breaks do not make the time series volatility. The concept of volatility curve is not clearly explained.</p> <p>3) No, the details of data are given under abstract in much detail which is not required. It is claimed that the two methodologies are suggested by the authors but that is not true. Even if it is the case, the detailed modification is not explained throughout the article.</p> <p>4) These subsections intend to build up a good article but unfortunately it is not the case from the text of the subsections. More explanation is needed in every section. The discussion and conclusion section are more like literature review and do not discuss the empirical analysis and suggested modification properly.</p> <p>5) the conclusion about the scientific correction and validity of the suggested methodology can only be established if this suggested modification is compared analytically and empirically with the other earlier existing alternative techniques, however, nothing such is done in the article, therefore, the article is only an application of the so-called claimed suggested modification and may or may not be correct scientifically.</p> <p>6) incomplete references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Almost yes. It seems that English is not the native language of the authors so somewhat it conveys their message.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is not suitable for publication</p>	

PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amena
Department, University & Country	Pakistan