

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_124042
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling cereal yield forecasting using Machine learning techniques for Shri Ganganagar, Rajasthan, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	The article is having practical utility in predicting yield of rice and wheat crop using machine learning techniques by making use of weather data of that particular district. It can be refined and can be extended to the state as a whole.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title can be more precise by using rice and wheat instead of cereals as awhile , as the research is focussed on these major crops only.	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The study was done using 2 years of data for the analysis. The research tested the more accurate methods among the available methods for the prediction of the yield of rice and wheat crops and the best suited were identified.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is good.	
Optional/General comments	In table 4, nRMSE value for wheat in testing stage is recorded as 8.39, but in last paragraph prior to tbale , it is noted as 4.26. kindly correct it.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karthika V P
Department, University & Country	Kerala Agricultural University, India