

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_127072
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding Consumer Behavior Using Big Data Analytics
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript offers a thorough examination of how big data analytics enhances the understanding of consumer behavior, which is essential for businesses aiming to tailor marketing strategies effectively. By focusing on the impact of data volume, velocity, and variety on consumer insight, the study provides valuable information on the tools and models available for analyzing complex datasets. The work is relevant and beneficial for researchers and professionals seeking to leverage big data for strategic consumer insights.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is mostly suitable, but a clearer option could be: "Leveraging Big Data Analytics to Understand Consumer Behavior: A Comprehensive Review." This emphasizes both the analytical process and the study's depth.	
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.	The abstract is generally well-rounded, but could be improved by specifying some of the data analytics techniques mentioned later in the paper, such as predictive and descriptive analysis. Including examples of consumer behavior aspects influenced by big data, like purchase patterns and sentiment analysis, would make the abstract more informative.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are well-organized, and the manuscript is easy to follow. However, the sections on "Volume, Velocity, and Variety" and "Big Data Tools and Technologies" could benefit from further clarity by listing tools and examples (e.g., Hadoop for storage, Spark for processing) in a table format to improve readability and organization.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, as it explains concepts like the 3 Vs of big data and provides a logical breakdown of methodologies used in consumer behavior analytics. However, the research could be further validated by adding examples from real-world applications, like Amazon's use of predictive analytics for product recommendations, to demonstrate practical implications of these methods in businesses.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are comprehensive and recent, including studies from 2018–2022, which support the contemporary relevance of the manuscript. There are no additional references needed.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly clear, but the manuscript could be improved by reducing redundancy in some sections, such as repeating the definition of big data characteristics. For example, "Volume, Velocity, and Variety are the three Vs that are typically used to describe big data" is stated multiple times. Condensing this definition to one section would improve flow.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript does not present any apparent ethical issues.	

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:	Kaushikkumar Patel
Department, University & Country	US