

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_114978
Title of the Manuscript:	Election Voting Trend Prediction System
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> While the manuscript addresses a pertinent issue concerning election prediction in Nigeria, it requires revisions to enhance its significance and contribution to the scientific community. Clearer articulation of the research novelty and implications for electoral reforms is necessary to establish its importance. The title adequately reflects the research topic but could be more specific in conveying the focus of the study. A revised title highlighting the use of Bayesian networks and K-Nearest Neighbor algorithms for election prediction in Nigeria would be more appropriate. The abstract provides a concise overview of the research objectives and methodology but lacks specificity in highlighting the key findings and implications. It requires revision to accurately summarize the main contributions of the study. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate but would benefit from minor revisions to improve coherence and flow between sections. Clear transitions between subsections and a consistent formatting style would enhance readability. The scientific correctness of the manuscript is generally sound, but revisions are needed to address methodological gaps and strengthen the interpretation of results. Clearer explanations of feature selection criteria and algorithm parameters are essential for ensuring the scientific rigor of the study. All the references cited in the manuscript are quite dated, with most of them being nearly a decade old. Additionally, the number of references seems limited, potentially limiting the breadth and currency of the literature review. Could you please provide more recent references to ensure the inclusion of the latest advancements and research findings in the field of election prediction and data mining? <p>Major Concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript exhibits characteristics more aligned with a Research Paper than a Review Paper, focusing on presenting original research findings rather than synthesizing existing literature. Enhancing clarity and organization is imperative for the manuscript. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology section requires a more detailed explanation, encompassing data pre-processing, model training, evaluation metrics, and the rationale behind k value selection for KNN. The results section would benefit from strengthening, particularly by incorporating performance metrics and visualizations to provide a clearer depiction of the findings. It is recommended to include a discussion section to address limitations of the study and compare the obtained results with existing literature, thereby providing a more comprehensive analysis of the research outcomes. The references should be updated with recent publications to ensure the inclusion of the latest research findings and maintain the relevance of the study. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Proofreading for clarity and coherence would enhance the readability of the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No	
----------------------------------	--	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sandeep Jaiswal
Department, University & Country	Mody University of Science and Technology, India