



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14563
Title of the Manuscript:	Forecasting the Number of Muslim Pilgrims Using NARX Neural Networks with a Comparison Study with other Modern Methods
Type of the 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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors applied a powerful tool, NARX Neural Network, to accomplish the forecast task and reach promising results. The references research is well done. The written could be improved: there are online free courses from big universities, e. g. Stanford, which could help. • The information in some figures is repeated on tables, for example, the Table (3.1) just show the same information from Figure (3.3) in a different manner. I suggest to substitute the numbers in x-axis on Figure (3.3) by the years and delete the Table (3.1) and suggest the same procedure for all tables that simply repeat the figure information; • There is a mistake on reference section, which is the references 20 and 21 are exactly the same. The reference Shaarawy et.al (2014), cited in section 4, 1st paragraph, is not in the reference section; • The items from 1 to 7 of pages 13 and 14, are only saying the information from tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. I propose to delete these seven items and the three tables and make a new table showing the results from Bayesian, Box and Jenkins and NARX results side-by-side and just conclude that NARX can provide better results. It will be much easier to the reader; • The authors should provide an explanation why	Thanks for your great comments, and sorry for my English. I deleted table (3.1) and showed the years on x-axis. Yes Sir, we corrected it. That is good idea to eliminate redundancy, also we deleted that tables and put the results in one meaningful table. Concerning the number of input delay and



SDI Review Form 1.6

	used four delayed inputs and feedback entries. Did they try another configuration?	hidden layers, yes I tried many configuration and that was the best for performance.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• The Figures index should follow some pattern: in the manuscript, sometimes it comes before the figure, between brackets, and in others after the figure without brackets; • It is important to define what ARIMA is in the first time that appears in the text; • Try to reduce the introduction because it is the front-door to the reader. They cannot feel tired in the beginning; • In the page 5, first line, there is "gradient-descending learning gradient algorithm". I believe that the second gradient should be deleted from the text; • I believe that Figure (3.1) is not necessary and Figure (3.2) could be replaced for a figure from the author.	That was good notice and we unified the format for all figures. We put the definition for both ARIMA and ARMA. Yes we did. You are right, I deleted it. Very good comment I removed both figures, and replaced them by other figures in new subsection about learning algorithm.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• The author could consider substitute some verbs "to be" by strong verbs, turn passive in active voice when it is possible, and avoid negative statements, for example, not known=unknown, in order to improve the written; • The author could consider change the year from Islamic calendar to the common calendar to make the paper easier to the reader;	Sorry for my poor language.