



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_60216
Title of the Manuscript:	Trajectory of COVID-19 Data in India: Investigation and Project Using Artificial Neural Network, Fuzzy Time Series and ARIMA models
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The paper need to be developed in terms of English. There are several grammar mistakes such as Due to the strong of Corona virus -> Due to the strength of Coronavirus take optimal decisions for master -> take optimal decisions to master In term of model adequacy -> In terms of model adequacy findings help for preparation the health system in India more efficient -> findings help the more efficient preparation for the health system in India.</p> <p>The most important point is a large estimation error in the results for instance Table 3 shows a large value of the RMSE that is equal to 40 in the best method. This level of the accuracy error cannot acceptable in this specific case study (COVID-19).</p> <p>Obviously, this research needs more efforts and investigations in order to improve the current results. I strongly recommend to authors using state-of-the-art machine learning techniques like Deep Neural Networks.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mehdi Neshat
Department, University & Country	The University of Adelaide, Australia