

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_109191
Title of the Manuscript:	Decomposition with the Additive Model using Buys-Ballot Approach when Trend-Cycle Component is Quadratic in Time Series
Type of the Article	Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This study examines the use of the Buys-Ballot procedure in time series analysis, focusing on quadratic trend-cycle components. The study found that periodic standard deviations are stable, but seasonal standard deviations differ, indicating the need for transformation to make seasonal indices additive. The adjusted residual mean is zero and variance is 0.1541, indicating the fitted model is inadequate. The study also tested seasonality in the additive model using the Buys-Ballot table, detecting seasonal indices in the periodic and overall sample variances. Results showed that Buys-Ballot estimates are only functions of seasonal indices, while those of equations 24 and 27 are functions of trend parameters. The study provides decomposition with the additive model when the trend cycle component is quadratic.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes. But could avoid the equation in the abstract.</p> <p>Yes. (3 Methodology could be rewrite, More that 15 references were cited in paragraph format, could be use table as separate methodology by year wise.)</p> <p>Yes. This study has provided decomposition with the additive model when trend cycle component is quadratic.</p> <p>Yes. Make references in standard forms.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on abstract. 2. Methodology is not clear. 3. Make references in standard forms. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This Paper is recommended for publication after minor revision.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Victor A
Department, University & Country	Vellore Institute of Technology, India