

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_124091
Title of the Manuscript:	Developing a Hybrid ARIMA-XGBOOST Model for Analysing Mobile Money Transaction Data in Kenya.
Type of the Article	Conceptual 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 very well-organized manuscript. This is a unique approach to capture the dynamics of mobile money transactions of Kenya. The model developed is an improvement to the normal ARIMA forecasting model.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it seems a suitable Title	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but it is highly suggested to remove the compartmentalization of the abstract and try to write it in a single paragraph. It is highly suggested to trim the abstract and have a well-detailed introduction later on.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Structures need to be worked on. Please include an introduction, a review of previous works if possible and remove conclusion from the abstract.	
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.	It is a great manuscript with all the details in the most robust manner. All the prerequisites of time series forecasting has been maintained. Even a modified model has been developed overcoming the shortcomings of ARIMA.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are good. Recent studies have been included. If possible, more references can be added to make the manuscript more robust.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is good. Language is also lucid, just format your paragraphs some spacing issue it seems.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is good and it is robust, it is neither too generic nor too technical. Work on abstract and formatting.	

#### 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:	Aman Shreevastava
Department, University & Country	Purnea University, India