

Peer Review

Review of: "Enhancing Project Performance Forecasting using Machine Learning Techniques"

Odey Alshboul¹

1. Hashemite University, Jordan

Before the paper is ready for publication, I have outlined the necessary revisions below, which I hope will assist you in improving the manuscript:

1. It is recommended that the authors seek assistance from a native English speaker, as there are several typos and linguistic errors that need correction.
2. Please provide a more concise version of the abstract, clearly identifying the main research gap addressed in this work. The abstract should offer a brief but comprehensive summary of the study, including the research objectives, methodology, and key findings. Also, the authors should explain why this study is important, what has been done, how it has been accomplished, and why the proposed model is superior to other approaches.
3. The introduction is inadequately written and does not effectively reference prior studies. The authors should thoroughly review the existing literature, identify gaps, and clearly describe how their approach addresses these gaps. Furthermore, it is essential to include recent references in the fields of machine learning and predictive modeling to strengthen the research. For example, the authors should consider citing recent articles related to these areas:

<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/CI-10-2021-0196/full/html>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0957417423020079>

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00477-023-02509-x>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0360835224001670>

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13588265.2022.2130608>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2352012424001619>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S095741742400486X>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0301479724022205>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0951832024005301>

4. The contribution of your research to the existing body of knowledge should be clearly explained.
5. The “materials and methods” section is inadequately presented. It is crucial to outline the research process step-by-step in a systematic manner.
6. The originality of the paper needs to be articulated more clearly. Robust results are necessary to substantiate the novelty expected in a high-quality journal article.
7. The rationale behind selecting the studied problem should be explicitly justified within the study.
8. A comparative analysis of your results with those from other studies is essential to strengthen the Discussion section. This comparison will highlight the scientific value of your work more effectively.
9. The results section requires more detailed explanations and interpretations, as the current content is not sufficient.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.