



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_28107
Title of the Manuscript:	Scalable functions used for empirical forecasting
Type of the Article	Short communication

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	<p>The paper is well and clearly written but a few mistakes have to be corrected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...they are form the family..." (p. 2) - maybe from? • "...As, such, the average..." (p.6) – "...As such ..." • Reference [11] – you should add the publication date <p>You should write short conclusion (as separate section) to sum up your main results of the manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript can be published after consideration the mentioned remarks.</p>	<p>The changes have been made, and I thank the reviewer to point out these errors. However, the conclusions have not been changed into a separate section because the format of the paper is of a short communication that normally does not have sections. A question was sent to the editor to ask how the manuscript should be formatted. Pending this information the document at this point was left unaltered.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		