

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_128336
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study Of Monthly Consumer Price Index Using Arima Model In Nigeria
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper contributes to the body of knowledge, but I don't see much originality. The paper technically sound, but it can be improved.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	It can be improved	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It can be improved	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>Authors should provide the comments of the cited papers after introducing each relevant work. What readers require is, by convinced literature review, to understand the clear thinking/consideration why the proposed approach can reach more convinced results. This is the very contribution from authors. In addition, authors also should provide more sufficient critical literature review to indicate the drawbacks of existed approaches, then, well define the main stream of research direction, how did those previous studies perform? Employ which methodologies? Which problem still requires to be solved? Why is the proposed approach suitable to be used to solve the critical problem? We need more convinced literature reviews.</p> <p>The equations should be numbered such that the readers can follow them.</p> <p>What is the meaning of FCT (Acronyms must be written in full for the first time before using them in the subsequent text.)</p>	

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:	Emmanuel Antwi
Department, University & Country	Akenten Appiah-Menka University of Skills Training and Entrepreneurial Development, Ghana