

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_118731
Title of the Manuscript:	Forecasting Long Memory Time Series for Groundnut prices in Andhra Pradesh with Autoregressive Fractionally Integrated Moving Average
Type of the 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) While using GPH estimator could be considered a suitable choice to estimate fractional integrating order, the authors did not mention why they prefer this estimator compared to other alternatives. 2) The abstract should be completely rewrite in order to make it more interesting and informative. 3) The authors have no proper understanding or referencing methodology within the texts. For example, they said “we used Box-Pierce statistic ...”. However, the correct version is to say, “we used Box & Pierce (1970) statistic ...”. Unfortunately, this issue is spilled over throughout the entire manuscript. So, they should cite all the used references correctly. 4) In equation (3), the sign of moving average components should be positive. This problem should be corrected in all the equations such as equation (4). 5) In the beginning of section 2, it is stated that the model estimates either by the OLS or ML. First of all, this type of authoring is incorrect, because they should strictly indicate which technique is used. Secondly, the OLS cannot be used to estimate ARFIMA models. 6) There are several typos in mathematical formulas. 7) The paper structure is designed incorrectly. The authors should first examine the data for unit root and provide descriptive statistics, then model estimation, and finally diagnostic tests. 8) There is no literature review neither in within introduction nor as a separated section. 9) the authors have done a poor performance in explaining the methodology especially hypothesis tests. The explanation is far beyond just writing mathematical formulas. Besides, they did not explain why the model should be estimated by an ARFIMA. Moreover, the outcome of the GPH estimator should be tested by Z-statistic in order to evaluate if the fractional integrating order is statistically significant. It is strongly advised that the author study and use the following references in order to enhance the methodology and scientific value of the paper: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I) https://doi.org/10.33119/ERFIN.2019.4.2.1 II) http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304-4076(95)01749-6 III) https://doi.org/10.26794/2587-5671-2024-28-2-239-252 10) The models' residuals have not been tested for normality. If the error terms do not follow a normal distribution, the significance testing based on t and F statistics is unreliable. 11) Finally, the conclusion is too short and cannot illustrate an appropriate perspective of the overall idea of the manuscript with its achieved outcomes. Besides, the authors did not give a hint for future investigations by suggesting some ideas for interesting readers. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The paper needs an extensive proofreading.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Mostafa R. Sarkandiz
Department, University & Country	University of Calabria, Italy