



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
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 (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	In section 1, there is no need to introduce NN model in such an original way, because NN model is widely used in machine learning. The structure of Section 3 is quite hard to read. Some unnecessary parts need to be erased away! Fig. 3 needs to be plotted in a more clear way. Figs. 4-6 are not useful, indeed. They make this paper look like a student homework. The author seems not professional in figure presentation. Figs. 11-13 are poorly plotted. Language needs seriously revision. Considering the innovation, the structure, the language, and the presentation, I suggest to reject it at once.	Yes, we have reduced some unnecessary parts. We have included some statistical analysis and measurements concepts. At last we again presented statistical concepts to compare with real data and also added some profit concepts so that stock users can earn maximize profits at each trading.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Stock Price Prediction using NN method has been investigated for many years. But only short-term prediction may work well. More analyses concerning this aspect should be discussed. I can not see any innovation in this paper.	