

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_128678
Title of the Manuscript:	“Modeling and forecasting of potato production in Rajasthan and their yield sustainability”
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 topic is of utmost importance in the current scenario of increasing productivity and sustainability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Modelling based on what is not mentioned in the title. The title is quite generic.	
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 needs to be rewritten properly. The abstract is not defining clearly the results. Abstract needs to be rewritten. Introduction is quite generic. Latest research in this field is not cited. The paper is written in a report form and not as a journal publication.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Comparison with other algorithms need to be explored. I cannot find the accuracy of the said algorithm. How accurate is the suggested system. No comparison with current research in the same field is presented either in introduction or in results. Conclusion is very weak.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references need to increase.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No the article needs to be rewritten. Grammatical and typo errors are observed throughout the paper.	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ankita Harkare
Department, University & Country	RBU Nagpur, India