



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_48451
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Prediction Power of Models used to Predict Flight Delays at Jomo Kenyatta International Airport
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/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	<p>Title- Predict appeared two times consider revising the title, using suitable word for one predict</p> <p>Abstract- what is JKIA – it is written clearly in page 2 line 15 from bottom, but clarity need to be given when it appears first.</p> <p>Methodology-- The data was for the year 2017/2018..... Reparation from abstract. As abstract is large with 299 words author can think of deleting this information from abstract and keep in this section if possible.</p> <p>Page.4- Fig.2 showed convergence after 2500 observations- check as per the Fig.2 is it correct?</p> <p>Page.4— provide reference for “ e1071 package implemented in R software”</p> <p>Figure numbers 2, 3 & 4 – do not put them in brackets, use them in the text of the paper.</p> <p>Test and Train Data</p> <p>Fig.2 Y axis error is between 0.30 and 0.35</p> <p>Fig.3 Y axis error is between 0.2950 and 0.315</p> <p>Fig.4 Y axis error is between 0.32 and 0.36</p> <p>Is error values are absolute or percentage?</p> <p>Accuracy values are given in % (ex: 66.28%) in the paper text, and they are fractions (ex: 0.6618) etc. in Table.1.</p> <p>It gives confusion to reader, use either % or otherwise to maintain similarity in the paper.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Give some brief about the software (R-soft) used in work. Language mistakes can be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Good work</p> <p>Paper is very small, authors could have analysed the results obtained instead of just showing the results in the form of graphs.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shashidhar K Kudari
Department, University & Country	JNT University, India