

Paper: “Macroeconomic Forecasting Examining the COVID-19 Pandemic Using Selected Countries: A Machine Learning LSTM (Long Term Short Term Memory) Approach”

Submitted: 21 December 2021

Accepted: 18 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Brian Sloboda

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hamidreza Izadi
Chabahar Maritime University, Iran

Reviewer 2: Braione Pietro
University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

Reviewer 3: Blinded

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

it clearly presents objects,
methods, and results

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

grammatical and
spelling is good in this article

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

METHODS is good and clear

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

is good

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

the finding is accurate and
supported by the content

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

A rectangular text input field with a light gray border. Inside the field, the word "ok" is written in a simple black font. To the right of the text, there are three small square buttons stacked vertically, likely for undo, redo, and clear actions. Below the text area, there is a horizontal scroll bar with a small rectangular slider.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, there are some grammatical errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, but the author do not motivate their choices (for instance why they chose to use LSTM neural networks as their model rather than another kind of model).

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Partially; Section 4 (results) is too short, and fails in explaining the results of all the country experiments. The paper reports 26 (!) figures with results of the experiments and the authors explain just one of them. They should describe and explain all! Table 1 and the figures report the values of MSE and RMSE, while the text speaks of RMSE and nRMSE. The text moreover gives no guidance on what acceptable values for MSE, RMSE, nRMSE should be so these data are hard to interpret-

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

No. Given the sloppyness of section 4, the conclusions are not consequential. Moreover the conclusions section (section 5) contains a paragraph on gradient descent that is completely out of context, and that should be removed.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Not completely. There is a reference to a Wikipedia article, that is not acceptable as a reference in a scholar paper. How can the authors be sure that the Wikipedia article was edited only by Taleb and Cirillo and noone else?

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: