

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122527
Title of the Manuscript:	From ARIMA to LSTM: A comparative study of forecasting models for agricultural price prediction
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</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>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</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>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Authors attempt to Customers Churn in the Business Market is appreciable. There are certain issues to be addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why the authors had not selected bench mark dataset? 2. Dataset description is missing such as total number of available data, belonging domain, total number of transactions in day or month, etc. 3. Real outcome of the churn prediction is not explicitly described. 4. Technical implementation is not mentioned, only the PSO algorithm is mentioned with help of references, authors technical contribution lacks a lot. 5. The experimental design should be improved with mathematical or metaheuristics algorithms. 6. Paper needs through revision. 	

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:	M. Jeyakarthic
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India