

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121874
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Agricultural Commodity Forecasting: A Median-Based Combination of Time Series Models
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a good attempt to expose the most appropriate model for forecasting production of an agricultural commodity in a country regardless of the type of production systems in place. More so, other factors that could affect production levels are not considered thus giving a very simple (univariate) approach to forecasting.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable because it embodies exactly what the paper is discussing. It is easy to relate the title to the content.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	While I consider the abstract to be sufficient, I suggest that the author should have included more information about the estimation results of the models discussed. He should also mention the applicability of these findings to research for the benefit of other scholars.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I consider the subsections and the structure appropriate with the following suggestions for improvement: The author should inform readers about the research problem he was addressing in this paper because at the end we learn that the new knowledge being put across is that SCUM is the best model in commodity forecasting but the knowledge gap that led the author into writing this paper is not stated.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper is scientifically correct. However, the scholar needed to explain to the readers why he/she took a very simplistic (univariate) approach to commodity forecasting. In agriculture we all understand that rice production does not merely rely on the year of production but many other factors come into play. For instance unfavourable weather, outbreak of pests and diseases could lead to a serious drop in rice production. Such factors are not provided for in the model. There is also the issue of natural resource limit; production cannot keep on increasing forever because the country will eventually reach its productive resource limit and either hit a plateau or even a drop in rice production. In this case the model as specified would not hold. While the author claims that SCUM is appropriate for data that has extreme values or outliers, the kind of data used in this article cannot exhibit such a characteristic because it is an aggregate of the whole country. Such data is usually moderated by the government departments to an extent that it is always closer to the long term average.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is sufficient for scholarly communication. The author is however advised to proof read the work in order to correct minor typing errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is an informative article especially on application of time series data in research.	

Review Form 3

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 Musebe Namboka
Department, University & Country	Moi University, Kenya