Review of: "Machine Learning Methods in Algorithmic Trading: An Experimental Evaluation of Supervised Learning Techniques for Stock Price"

Md Sahabuddin[1]

1 Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics

The decision to reject your paper is based on several key factors:

i.   The conclusion section of your paper was found to be vague and lacking in convincing arguments.

ii. The paper was identified as needing extensive language editing.

iii. The paper did not provide information on the sources of the gathered data. It is crucial to disclose the brokers that provided the data to establish credibility and transparency in your research.

iv. The absence of a high-resolution chart for better visualization and comparison between predictions and real data was noted. Visual representations are essential for conveying results effectively.

v.   The paper lacked sufficient information to elucidate the differences between hybrid and ensemble models and the rationale behind using both.

vi. The paper was deemed not innovative enough. It was noted that the models used in the paper are classical and well-known in the machine learning field, with no apparent innovations or model revisions presented

vii. Some details related to data processing methods were considered unnecessary for a research paper. It is important to strike a balance between providing sufficient information and avoiding unnecessary details, maintaining the focus on the research contribution.

In summary, the paper did not meet the standards required for publication there for I reject.