

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_98602
Title of the Manuscript:	An application of ARIMAX model to examine the effect of climatic factors on the annual rice production in Bangladesh
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.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. It seems to me that the manuscript is important for the scientific community since it tries to establish the relationship between the effect of climatic factors on the annual rice production in Bangladesh. Rice production is of vital importance for Asian countries 2. I think the title is appropriate 3. The summary shows the basic elements of the investigation, or what the summary is pertinent, although it could be improved. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is adequate. However , the background could be substantially enriched by carrying out a more extensive bibliographical consultation . 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, it only remains at the descriptive stage, since no explanation is given to the possible causes of correlation between the correlated variables. I believe that it could be enriched and given a scope that is at least correlative and supported. Likewise, the conclusion is general and limited. More conclusions could be drawn from the results. 6. The references are not enough; it could be expanded by doing a more exhaustive bibliographic search and this will enrich the document. A third of the references are more than 10 years old	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language used is understandable and sufficient for most readers to understand the purpose and results of the article.	
Optional/General comments	It is necessary to carry out a scientific bibliographical investigation of the subject, incorporate it into the background, and finally more conclusions must be sought from the results and not only present a general conclusion. The references must be more and from the last years.	

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 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hermes Ulises Ramirez Sanchez
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Guadalajara, Mexico