



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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There is no Review of literature.. References are not cited properly. No empirical evidence There is no clear direction of the paper. No empirical evidences supported his argument	Thank you for reviewing our paper. The empirical data in the paper are the advantages and disadvantages of forecasting methods, which are used for a logical experiment. The experimental results are summarized appropriately in the Figs which allow to discuss the results and to get the appropriate conclusions. They can be used in further studies. All observations have been taken into account and corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	For me it looks like a term paper (still without any clear direction). The author must follow some format of writing research paper.	We have totally reviewed the paper, upgrading it to the appropriate format. Thank you for guidance.