



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	There is need for a compulsory revision of this article due to the following observations: 1) Abstract should be coherently merged and well-presented rather than segmenting it. 2) Introduction: It is extremely scanty and lacks vital information and background to the topic of the research. No adequate references to the past researchers' finding on the topic. Thus, the topic was poorly introduced. 3) Methodology: The methods adopted should highlight the nature of data collected and the method of collection should be briefly discussed 4) Results: The results are not well presented as its lacks facts and figures to support it. Some of the useful Tables 1-3 you presented under concluding part are supposed to be well discussed under "discussion of results". 5) Conclusion: Tables are not be placed under concluding part. Rather use facts and figures to conclude your research	Thank you for reviewing our paper. All points have been taken into account and corrected.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	1) General Overview: a) No adequate references b) Figures and tables are missed use in your presentation. c) Poor presentation of the work d) The aim of the research seems to match the conclusion	The manuscript has been totally reviewed in accordance with its objectives.