

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122969
Title of the Manuscript:	Stock price predictions using the N-BEATS deep learning architecture
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to offer significant contributions to its field, especially if it presents novel findings, new methodologies, or a comprehensive review of an emerging topic. The importance lies in how it advances understanding or solves critical issues within the discipline. I like this manuscript if it is well-organized, presents clear and convincing data, and offers insights that can lead to further research or practical applications.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of a manuscript should be concise, informative, and reflective of the main findings or the core topic of the paper. If the title accurately captures the essence of the study, then it is suitable. If not, I would suggest a more focused title that highlights the key aspect of the research..</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract should provide a concise summary of the manuscript, including the background, objectives, methods, key results, and conclusions. It should be clear and informative, allowing readers to understand the main findings without reading the full paper. If any critical information is missing or redundant, I would suggest adding or removing specific details. For example, if the results or the significance of the findings are not clearly stated, they should be included.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript should have a logical structure with clear subsections, such as Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. Each section should flow logically into the next, with clear headings and subheadings to guide the reader. If the manuscript lacks clarity or if the sections are not well-organized, I would suggest restructuring it to improve readability and coherence.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>For a manuscript to be scientifically robust, it must present accurate and reproducible data, sound methodologies, and logical conclusions based on the results. The research should be grounded in established theories or thoroughly justified if it challenges existing paradigms. If the study is well-designed, the data properly analyzed, and the conclusions logically derived from the evidence, then the manuscript is scientifically sound. Any claims made should be backed by solid evidence.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>The references should be recent, relevant, and sufficient to cover the scope of the research. They should include seminal papers as well as recent studies that reflect the current state of knowledge. If the manuscript lacks important references or relies too heavily on outdated sources, I recommend adding more recent literature to ensure a well-rounded discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language used in the manuscript should be clear, precise, and suitable for scholarly communication. It should avoid jargon where possible and use technical terms appropriately. The manuscript should be free from grammatical errors, and the sentences should be well-structured to convey the research findings effectively. If the language is unclear or difficult to follow, I would suggest revision to improve readability and ensure that the manuscript meets the standards of scholarly writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Farhang Salehi
Department, University & Country	Iran