

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_130252
Title of the Manuscript:	Forecasting the Prices of Poultry Egg and Meat in Major Markets of Karnataka Using ARIMA Models
Type of the Article	Case Study

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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 about the forecasting of price predictions in poultry egg and meat in the specific markets of Karnataka. It uses ARIMA model for the forecasting purpose. It is helpful for sustainability and stability in markets.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, It 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.	The below point can be added. It is helpful in making decisions during seasonal conditions, increase or decrease in the feed costs of the poultry, natural calamities, flu outbreaks, pandemic situations of the prices of the poultry.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The formula used for ARIMA model is incorrect in the error measure. Hence can be reviewed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are taken from the year 1999 to 2024. Since it is based on the formula the additional references are not needed much.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to be improved. Some of the words are joined together without any spaces. This sort of pattern is seen in the whole manuscript. English quality can be checked.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sudha K
Department, University & Country	Velammal Institute of Technology, India