

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<i>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</i>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120260
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>FORECASTING MAIZE PRODUCTION IN TELANGANA STATE USING ARIMA MODEL</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	I like this manuscript because it provides a comprehensive and detailed analysis of maize production forecasting in Telangana using the ARIMA model. The application of the Box-Jenkins methodology and the use of extensive empirical data enhance the credibility of the findings. However, the manuscript could benefit from a clearer explanation of some technical aspects and a more thorough discussion of the results.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, the title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the study. If an alternative title were to be suggested, it could be: "Application of ARIMA Model for Forecasting Maize Production in Telangana State".	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive but could be improved by including the key results and the implications of the study. Adding a sentence about the significance of the ARIMA model's accuracy in predicting future production would make the abstract more impactful.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The logical flow from introduction, material and methods, results and discussion, to summary and conclusions is well-organized and easy to follow.	
<b>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound. The use of the Box-Jenkins methodology for model identification, estimation, diagnostics, and forecasting is appropriate and well-explained. The steps taken to ensure the stationarity of the time series data and the diagnostic checks performed on the fitted model contribute to the scientific accuracy of the study. The manuscript also appropriately references established methodologies and prior studies.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> -	The references are sufficient but could be updated with more recent studies. Adding references from the last 2-3 years would enhance the manuscript's relevance. Some recent studies on time series forecasting in agriculture could provide additional insights and comparisons.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, some sentences could be rephrased for better clarity and readability. Minor grammatical errors should be corrected.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed explanation of the ARIMA model parameters (p, d, q) selection process.</li> <li>2. Including a table or figure summarizing the model diagnostics would be helpful.</li> <li>3. A discussion on the limitations of the ARIMA model and potential areas for future research would strengthen the manuscript.</li> </ol>	

### Review Form 3

#### **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>William George</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The University of Dodoma, Tanzania</b>