

# Review of: "Predicting Mobile Money Transaction Fraud using Machine Learning Algorithms"

Ijaz Shah

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to review the paper titled "Predicting Mobile Money Transaction Fraud using Machine Learning Algorithms". The author(s) has tried to conclude by applying logistic regression. This paper is a nice attempt, but it needs to address some minor as well as major issues. Addressing the following issues will help improving this paper:

## **Abstract**

It is a very interesting topic that analyzes Predicting Mobile Money Transaction Fraud using Machine Learning Algorithms. However, the author(s) needs to address some important issues.

1. I feel that the title of the paper needs to be revised, adding the words " An analysis of.....".
2. As per my understanding, the aim of the study should be in accordance with the study.
3. The methodology is not clearly mentioned.
4. I suggest that the author(s) needs to revise the abstract carefully.

## **Introduction and Literature Review**

1. This section is better but lacks coherence in the arguments presented. For example, the last part seems to be reduced and relocated in the context of its discussion and the objective of this study.
2. I feel that it will be better to add the heading of each section of introduction.
3. I suggest reviewing/ rewriting the introduction section and updated it to draw a more logical ground of this study.
4. There should be a testable hypothesis at the end of literature section.
5. The author(s) needs to revise the introduction and literature review carefully.

## **Methodology**

1. The author(s) has tried well to explain the methodology. But it would be good to mention the references from the literature in the measurement of variable section.
2. Secondly, it is hard to understand how the applied method is appropriate. The method may be appropriate but requires few lines to highlight the appropriateness of used method.
3. I suggest addressing the issues and add the required explanation.

## **Results**

1. The author(s) has tried well to explain the results. But i feel that the author(s) needs to add and interpret the descriptive statistics/ summary statistics of variables.

I believe that these comments will help the author(s) to improve this paper.