

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	<p>The authors done pre-harvest crop forecast for three districts of Gujrat using composite weather indices. After reviewing the manuscript, following observations came out.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In title, statistical technique should be specified, as there are so many methods. As authors used composite weather indices, it should come in title. 2. In abstract, abbreviation may be avoided and author should use simple and clear word to make it clear for readers. 3. The sentences needs to be reframed at many place and thoroughly checked to clarify the meaning. In addition, abbreviation is used before defining it at many places, like SMW. The author is advised to refer track change mode for corrections in manuscript. 4. Further, there seems correction in used forecast model as suggested by reviewer in manuscript. In equation, Xii'w may be replaced as Xi'w. If it is not so, authors may explain in detail difference between these two. 5. Is R² a good measure for fitting criteria? In addition of R², root mean square error, mean absolute percentage error and adjusted R² may be used. The table-1 in running text are not describing yield forecast as mentioned in text. It may be table-2. If so, corrections may be done accordingly. p value may be used in table-2 instead of F value. The estimate of intercepts are negative in some cases, it may be relooked. In table-3, absolute percentage error may be evaluated instead of error percentage. 6. Conclusion is general, not describing the findings of the study conducted. It should be quantified with further elaboration. 7. Lastly, authors may also want to discuss computational procedure and give references to the software used for the analysis. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Revision required	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manoj Kumar
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Central Institute of Agricultural Engineering, India