

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_130646
Title of the Manuscript:	A Statistical Approach for Analysis of Trend Pattern of Pigeon Pea in India
Type of the Article	Research

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive analysis of pigeon pea production trends in India, an essential crop for global food security and nutritional supply. By utilizing various statistical models and evaluating their accuracy, the study offers valuable insights into the most effective methods for forecasting agricultural trends. This can inform policymakers and researchers in developing strategies to enhance pigeon pea production, ultimately contributing to sustainable agriculture and food security.	The authors are highly thankful to the reviewer for the valuable comments on the manuscript.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the article is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Here are few suggestions for additions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Brief Context: Including a brief mention of the significance of pigeon pea in India's agriculture and diet in the abstract can highlight the importance of the study.Objective Statement: Clearly stating the objective of the study at the beginning of the abstract can provide immediate clarity to the reader.Key Results: Adding a specific statistical result or two can give readers a quick insight into the findings.	The corrections suggested by the reviewer have been incorporated in the revised manuscript, and highlighted.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The secondary time series data from the Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Govt. of India, is appropriately cited. The linear, exponential, quadratic, and cubic models are well-described with their respective equations. The principles of least squares and normal equations used for estimating the values of constants are correctly presented. The mathematical formulations and notations are accurate and relevant to the analysis.	The authors are highly thankful to the reviewer for the valuable comments on the manuscript.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent. However, the author needs to cite them properly. I've mentioned in the comments, in the manuscript file.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is clear, well-structured, and uses appropriate scientific terminology. However, there are a few areas where minor improvements could enhance readability and coherence. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Consistency: Ensure consistent use of abbreviations. For example, "DAC&FW" is mentioned once but not explained. It would be helpful to provide the full form initially and then use the abbreviation.Clarity: In the "Results and Discussion" section, when introducing tables, use clearer phrases. For example, instead of "The secondary time series data on area, production, and yield of pigeon pea in India is presented in Table 1," consider "Table 1 presents the secondary time series data on the area, production, and yield of pigeon pea in India." Consider rephrasing "the relative influence of the trend values on the observed values" to "the relationship between the trend values and the observed values."Grammar: In the "Conclusion" section, ensure subject-verb agreement. For example, change "the accuracy of the fitted models have been measured" to "the accuracy of the fitted models has been measured."	The corrections suggested by the reviewer have been incorporated in the revised manuscript, and highlighted.
Optional/General comments	<p>It appears that there are a few inconsistencies in the citation and references section of the manuscript. Firstly, make sure all citations in the text are properly linked to the reference list; for instance, the use of "[1]" and "[2]" should correspond to detailed references. I've mentioned that as comments in the original manuscript.</p>	The citations and references are modified as per the reviewer's suggestions and highlighted in the revised manuscript.

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	