



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_26353
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF FORECASTING METHODS AS A TOOL FOR INFORMATION STRUCTURING IN SCIENCE RESEARCH
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The abstract is to be reviewed (It was necessary to study forecasting methods to identify a general approach to information structuring and choose the most efficient and approximated to natural intelligence method: NO A forecasting methods to identify a general approach to information structuring and to choose the most efficient and approximated to natural intelligence method was investigated) (The data collected as a result of logical experiment are presented consecutively in figures.....It cannot be written in an abstract 'presented consecutively in figures') Study design and methodology are equal....they have to be rewritten. Keywords have to be short Methods of study section is too short. Research organization is too poor and too similar to the abstract. Comparing known forecasting methods section has to be expanded. Individual intuition methods and collective expert estimation section have to present the several updated sources for every methods. (Its disadvantages are also obvious. The choice of solution method is subjective as it is based on 76 individual or group experience and does not cover all	Thank you for reviewing our paper. All observations have been taken into account. The manuscript has been totally reviewed and corrected to the extent that not only clarifies some points but better presents our outcomes.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	possible solution options currently known. This method does represent further interconnection with the information on solution methods, which is typical for NI when solving such forecasting problems, yet it is incomplete as it is based only on the individual experience. However, there are plenty of theoretical developments for solving problems of the kind, which might be unknown to the individual, yet far more efficient....this sentence has to be clarified) The presentation of Discussion section is too poor. (This method visualizes the way the NI searches for the problem solution among the knowledge 205 specifically structured there, along with specifying the information on the object of study, which proves 206 the necessity of its utilization in AI, the closest to NI in operating..... this sentence has to be clarified) Generally, figures must not be inserted in the conclusions but in the discussion or results section. Generally, sources in conclusions section must 'recall' source inserted in the main body of the paper. Reference section has to be made homogeneous. SO ALL PAPER HAS TO BE STRUCTURED CAREFULLY AGAIN. <u>Plagiarism is not suspected but the following sentence:</u> 'Having compared a number of typical forecasting methods, we have found out that they are 265	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	unsuitable for the use in IDSS of such kind. Therefore, we propose to use Intelligence Enhancement 266 Method (IEM), our development which was publicized in a few papers, for structuring information on the area of studies and the problems to be solved thereby in a special way. It is 267 characterized by a 268 fairly high degree of novelty [11]	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		