

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_96070
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Seasonal ARIMA model to predict wholesale price of rice in Delhi market
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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For my opinion this manuscript is important for scientific community. This article is a scientific research of great interest for the economy of India. It presents a model for seasonal forecasting of the wholesale price of rice in the Delhi economy.</li> <li>I think that the title of article fit well with its content. The title is suitable with the entire article.</li> <li>I think that the abstract should be more comprehensive, including a little more detail from the conclusions of the model used in the study.</li> <li>The article is correctly worded with the appropriate divisions necessary to provide the appropriate information in each section.</li> <li>I think this article is scientifically correct according according to the rules of writing an academic paper</li> <li>Yes, I think the references are recent and sufficient .</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This article is understandable, clear and written in a written language that is expressed correctly. The model used is clearly explained through econometric equations. What I would suggest is that the author could expand a bit more on the conclusions presented at the end on the 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)
<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:	Eliona Gremi
Department, University & Country	University of Elbasan "A.Xhuvani", Albania