

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_103528</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Iteration and Identification of the Best ARIMA Models for forecasting Groundnut Area, Production and Yield in India and Telangana.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The manuscript provides some general information and uses a tool (SPSS). The scientific background of the ARIMA model is poorly discussed. The methodology and results analysis needs significant improvements.</p> <p>The title is too general. The best model for a purpose sounds like a too big claim.</p> <p>The abstract represents the study but involves claims that need to be validated.</p> <p>Needs to be improved</p> <p>Sufficient information for the validation of the results is not provided.</p> <p>The lack of an adequate literature review is among the major concerns. The author must improve the literature review. Provide a brief insight into various applications of the applied models (e.g., doi:10.12691/ajwr-5-4-1). Also, review and include recent related studies and explain what the contributions of the current work are.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Considerable correctness and clarity errors were observed. The manuscript requires to be edited, and the language needs to be improved.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>A considerable number of formatting errors were observed. e.g., all figures are distorted. Related literature must be extensively reviewed. The methodology needs to be improved. Note that mentioning using a tool and providing some general information is not appropriate for a scientific model. Computer model results could be misleading if the operator has not reasonable understanding of how they work, their reliability, interpretation of their results, etc.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Engineering, University of Guelph, Canada</b>