



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMCS_45438</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE PREDICTION USING CLASSIFICATION ALGORITHMS</b>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The following strong reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract- The Readability and flow of the abstract with regard to the area of the research is not fully clear, contributions and objectives are not mentioned. Results and outcome is also not properly foreseen while drafting the abstract of the paper.</li> <li>2. Introduction aspect, is not complete in itself. It requires more comprehensive information so that it is better worked out regarding what aspects the research is carried out and what novelty is attained.</li> <li>3. Literature- Lots of serious Grammatical and English Flow mistakes are there. The paper section of Literature requires re-drafting as the language is not working in proper sense.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract contained the objectives of the work, methodology, result and discussion. The review should state clearly what he/she thinks it should contain.</li> <li>2. Introduction in our understanding is the brief discussion of the paper title. The authors deeply believe justice was done to it.</li> <li>3. Noted. The corrected manuscript has taken care of that.</li> </ol>

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	