

Review of: "Bank Customer Churn Prediction Using SMOTE: A Comparative Analysis"

Hairani Hairani

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The urgency of the research problem needs to be clarified again.
2. In related work, the author needs to summarize the differences between this research and previous research so that its novelty can be seen.
3. The author needs to compare the following similar research: A new approach of hybrid sampling SMOTE and ENN to the accuracy of machine learning methods on unbalanced diabetes disease data
4. The author needs to explain the SMOTE way of balancing data in the form of a flow diagram or flowchart so that it is easy to understand.
5. The steps involved in GA need to be made in flowchart form
6. It is necessary to explain why accuracy, precision, f1-score, and recall are used in measuring the performance of SMOTE data results
7. It needs to be explained why the KNN method is better than Random Forest, even though RF is more reliable in SMOTE data.
8. In Table 6, the author needs to compare with the same dataset to see the differences.
9. The author needs to explain the limitations of this research, so that it can be continued in further research.
10. The number of references is very small, it would be best to add a minimum of 40 references from reputable international journals in the last 5 years.