



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_49250
Title of the Manuscript:	Adaptive Variable Weight Accumulation AVWA-DGM(1,1) Model Based on Particle Swarm Optimization
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>)

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	The author(s) did an excellent work. However 1. The Abstract did not provide a snap shot of the results discussed in the research 2. Conclusions need to be elaborated 3. The figures are not clear and they need to be clear	Dear Reviewer, <input type="checkbox"/> We would like to express our thankfulness for your much constructive and valuable advices. We have revised the paper following your comments and suggestions. The changes made in the revision appear in yellow, and the answers to your comments are listed as follows. <input type="checkbox"/> Following your suggestion , we have made the corresponding changes to the summary section. <input type="checkbox"/> Following your suggestion , we have made corresponding changes and additions to the conclusions section. <input type="checkbox"/> Thank you for your carefully read and detailed comments,we have changed the unclear picture to make it clearer.
Minor REVISION comments	 1. The method need to be clearly stated 2. The references need to be consistence	<input type="checkbox"/> Thank you very much for your question, thank you for reading our article carefully. We have added some descriptions in the theoretical part to make our improvement method clearer. <input type="checkbox"/> Thank you for your carefully read and detailed comments , When we saw this amendment, we attached great importance to this opinion. For your comments, we have modified the references and mapped them one by one.
Optional/General comments	The equations are perfectly presented with much clarity	Finally, we have thoroughly revised the paper in order to present a more clear and concise manuscript. We hope these corrections will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments. With Best Regards. Lang Yu & Co-authors.

PART 2:

	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)
--	--------------------	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>