



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_9819
Title of the Manuscript:	Stock Market Behavior Prediction Using NN based Model
Type of the Article	Method 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The topic of this paper is intriguing and meaningful. The overall scientific quality of this paper is excellent with well-formatted and written language. The practical significance of this paper is obvious and the technical soundness is strong. The title and abstract reflect the paper's content clearly and the introduction presents the problem clearly. Experimental methods, the quality of tables and the discussion are adequate. The results and conclusions are justified. All the references are complete, adequate and highly relevant. However, the literature review part is too simple, lacking the comparison of NN and other prediction methods, like EPNN, AHP, FAHP. Why does the author choose NN even though it's not comparatively new?	Yes, literature review part does not contain new methods like EPNN, AHP because I am new researcher for neural network study. In future I will introduce as per suggested methods. But this time I have presented neural network concept as my ability.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		