

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_123551
Title of the Manuscript:	TRENDS AND FORECAST OF PROSTATE CANCER INCIDENCES USING ARIMAX MODELS IN MERU COUNTY, KENYA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**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 manuscript, holds significance for the scientific community as it addresses a critical health issue in a region where cancer research is underrepresented. The study develops predictive models using ARIMAX to forecast prostate cancer incidences, providing valuable insights that can inform public health planning and intervention strategies. By incorporating age as an exogenous variable, the manuscript enhances the accuracy of predictions, offering a robust tool for resource allocation and future cancer control programs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article looks better if put in this form "Time series Analysis of Incidence of Prostate Cancer in Meru County". The word "Kenya" and the method employed "ARIMAX" reflect in the methodology not in the 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 should start with INTRODUCTION and end the introduction with the AIM of the study not the objectives. Please removed and moved "Study design" and "Place and Duration of Study" to METHODOLOGY. After methodology, Results and then conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is good, but the figures title and resolutions are poor. All figures should be well labelled, most especially FIGURE 6, should be a table (publication format) not figure.	
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.	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. First, it employs well-established statistical methodologies, such as the ARIMAX model, which is a recognized tool in time series analysis, particularly when incorporating exogenous variables like age. The use of the Box-Jenkins methodology, including model identification, parameter estimation, diagnostics, and forecasting, demonstrates adherence to rigorous statistical procedures. Additionally, the manuscript carefully tests for stationarity and applies appropriate transformations, such as differencing and log transformations, to ensure the validity of the model assumptions. By validating the model through Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and using diagnostics like the Ljung-Box test, the study ensures that the results are reliable and unbiased.</p> <p><b>Suggestion</b></p> <p>The Box-Jenkins methodology should be reference in the methodology for clear understanding by the reader.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Box jekins methodology should be reference.	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Put all tables in Publication format, increase the resolution of the figures and label correctly. Check the abstracts word by word, it should be writing in past tense.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hakeem Adekunle</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Georgia State University, USA</b>