

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_89374
Title of the Manuscript:	Sales Anomaly Detection Using Automatic Time Series Decomposition
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:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy> )

## 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) <b>Thank you for taking the time to review our work. We appreciate. We shall provide our responses to each comment for your perusal. The changes are highlighted with "YELLOW" in the main manuscript.</b>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The abstract should be written in one paragraph.</li><li>2. Before using the abbreviation, the authors must first define the terms. For example, DBSCAN and OPTICS, what does these abbreviation mesn?</li><li>3. It would be better if the aim of this work is mentioned at the "However, they do not give a method for matching anomalous spots to precise dates of anomaly occurrence, which is the purpose of our study." Sentence. This would better highlight the importance of this work.</li><li>4. The form of tense use is figure 1 should be consistent. In some part, the authors are using passive form but is some part the authors are using active form. The authors must use one form of tense.</li><li>5. The Experiment Results section is incorrectly labelled. It should be 3.1 and not 2.2</li><li>6. The explanation that the authors wrote in the "Experiment Results" section is not the results. It is more of a description of the module and software used in this work. This would be better put in the methodology section. In this section, the authors must show what are the result of the ice cream data that was downloaded from literature.</li><li>7. The Discussion section is incorrectly labelled. It should be 3.2 and not 2.2. This section should be changed from "discussion" to "result and discussion" as this is where the result from the models are shown and discussed.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Thank you for taking the time to review our work. Comment noted, and the abstract was rewritten as directed.</li><li>2. Thank you for your comments. The DBSCAN and the OPTICS are defined in our updated work according to your comments.</li><li>3. Thank you for your comment. The sentence has been rephrased in the main manuscript.</li><li>4. Thank you for your comments. We have modified it as suggested.</li><li>5. Thank you for your comment. We have modified it accordingly</li><li>6. Thank you for your comments. This section is rewritten and modified accordingly</li><li>7. Comment well noted. We have modified it accordingly.</li></ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The "k" in the "thesis examined the performance of several clustering algorithms, including k-Means," sentence should be capital.</li><li>2. "Automatic Time Series Decomposition" can be abbreviated to ATSD as mentioned in the abstract. For the next use for example in the "Section 2 outlines the methodology used in this study, including data acquisition and description and Automatic Time Series Decomposition;" sentence, the authors can just use the abbreviation.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Thank you for your comment. We have modified accordingly.</li><li>2. Thank you for your comment. We have modified accordingly.</li></ol>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	