

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_94891
Title of the Manuscript:	Pre-harvest forecasting models for kharif rice yield in south Gujarat using statistical technique
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important key words missing in the Abstract; • Attend to sentence structure, text/word repetition, and grammar. The Grammarly tool can help. • How was the Validity of the preferred models tested? Regression models have the tendency to result in high levels of the random error term. How would this be reduced? • Identify intervening and moderating variables that would likely impact the veracity of the identified models. • What do you have to say about the impact of the global climate change phenomenon on your model(s)? • Does the model apply for ratoon crops and the distortions arising thereof? • Apart from the use of the coefficient of determination and F-test is there an alternative that would be more accurately predictive? • A value of 1.0 for R² indicates a perfect fit, and is thus a highly reliable model for future forecasts, while a value of 0.0 would indicate that the calculation fails to accurately model the data at all. Please comment in light of your study results. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Apart from the government and farmers, who would be the other stakeholders of interest (researchers, etc...??)	
Optional/General comments	After documenting "results", "discussion" and "conclusions", it is important to provide direction/recommendation(s) for future research based on the outcomes of your study.	

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)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elijah W Chindia
Department, University & Country	University of Nairobi, Kenya