

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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Despite the importance of the topic in question, the treatment given in the article is superficial and there are, in my opinion, some structural errors in the material.	
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.	The abstract is written in a format not usual for scientific articles. In general, the abstract brings the central idea of the article, the methodology used and some results in a running text format and not in the format presented in the material, that is, separately, as if they were topics.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	
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.	The manuscript, despite bringing a relevant topic, does not present a robust development of the theme. The study done is quite superficial and the text is somewhat wordy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Although the manuscript has 19 references, I believe that not all of them were cited. In addition, I believe that articles that use ARIMA and ARIMAX in other contexts should be cited in the introduction to reinforce the importance of using these models in the proposed context.	

Review Form 3

<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In some parts of the text, the English is not spelled correctly, as well as the punctuation part.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Although the manuscript brings a relevant theme, the study of a specific model of time series to treat a context in evidence all over the world - cancer itself - the scientific treatment addressed in the text is very superficial and long-winded. The material itself reads more like a report than an article itself. Substantial improvements would be needed for the text to be considered at all. That is my opinion. I hope I have helped.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria do Carmo Soares de Lima
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil