

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_122223
Title of the Manuscript:	The Box-Jenkins approach: forecasting of organic sorghum production in Chhattisgarh, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	Yes, the manuscript delves into the impact of organic sorghum production in Chhattisgarh, India. Although this subject has been addressed in previous literature, each study has approached organic sorghum production from a distinct perspective. Therefore, this manuscript is pertinent to ongoing research in the country.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, because the title has not yet reflected the research issues. The title of the thesis can be rewritten as: forecasting of organic sorghum production in Chhattisgarh, India: ARIMA model approach. Because, in time series analysis, the Box-Jenkins method, named after statisticians George Box and Gwilym Jenkins, applies autoregressive moving average (ARMA) or autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA) models to find the time series that best models the past values of a time series.	
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.	No, because the abstract is unclear about the purpose, methodology, results, and suggestions.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, because the basic structure of the research article includes an introduction, literature review, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion, thus, the manuscript has no discussion section.	
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.	No, the manuscript's introduction is lacking crucial elements like its purpose, methodology, motivation, and highlights. Although primarily based on literature to find gaps, a literature review is absent.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Doan Van Dinh
Department, University & Country	Institute of Finance and Accounting, Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam