

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_98214
Title of the Manuscript:	Forecasting Area, Production and Productivity of Groundnut in Rajasthan Using Auto Regressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) Model
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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ This study does not fully provide the underpinning argument – what discourse does this research reflect in order for the author to defend a knowledge claim? What does the study add to the already known Body of Knowledge on the subject matter?</li> <li>➤ This study uses predetermined analytical models. A model is as good as its magnitude of residual error. The ARIMA Model has the tendency to retain high values of the error term. The author's results and discussion point to this fact. Would alternative models (e.g. neuro-networks) have yielded the same conclusions? A short discussion would have been of help, and in fact the use of alternative models may have led to more robust conclusions as to which model is superior and more reliable.</li> <li>➤ When assessing outcomes of any study, one needs to carefully consider the many moderating and intervening variables that would impact the dependent variables besides the independent variables. This is one study that would call for that on account of several uncontrolled variables, e.g. climate change, efficacy of groundnut seed, labour attitudes, etc. A Model(s) that incorporates extenuating variables makes the study even more novel.</li> <li>➤ Construct a simple <b>conceptual framework</b> that the scientific community can refer to and relate with.</li> <li>➤ The introduction should incorporate statement of the problem in question form. That forms the hypothesis to be tested.</li> </ul> <p>Consider: "Accuracy of predicting crop area, production and productivity of groundnut in Rajasthan state, India, using descriptive statistics, autocorrelation and ARIMA Models."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ An abstract should be one continuous paragraph without any sub-headings or sub-paragraphs.</li> <li>➤ A number of important key words are missing.</li> </ul> <p>"Literature Review" is non-existent, although some authors have been referenced. It is important to paraphrase or copy out excerpts from the central assertions of various authors, examine their views and critique the logic and arguments in order to formulate own stance..</p> <p>To an extent, especially the analytical tools.</p> <p>References are sufficient in scope and scale.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Mind sentence construction and structure consistent with grammarly.</li> <li>➤ Explain the use of the word "tomato" under paragraph one, item 3.</li> <li>➤ The word "productivity" carries different meanings. Define the meaning you attached to the word and ensure it aligns with the analytical results thus obtained..</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Were <b>homoscedacity</b> and <b>heteroscedacity</b> tests done on the model(s) used for the study?</li> <li>➤ Being a longitudinal study, when predictor variables in the same regression model are correlated, they cannot independently predict the value of the dependent variable. Was <b>collinearity/multicollinearity</b> tested for?</li> <li>➤ Who is the study intended for? Be specific about who the stakeholders are (government, farmers, researchers, educators, agricultural extension officers, etc, etc).</li> <li>➤ What recommendations does the author offer for further research in this field?</li> </ul>	

**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>Elijah W Chindia</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Nairobi, Kenya</b>