

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_129255
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing ARFIMA and ARIMA Models in Forecasting Under Five Mortality Rate in Tanzania
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>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the critical task of forecasting under-five mortality rates (UFMR), a vital public health indicator. By exploring advanced time-series modeling approaches, it provides a methodological framework that can be applied to other demographic or health-related data. The study contributes to the growing body of literature on long-memory processes and their role in understanding complex temporal dynamics in public health. Such research is essential for improving data-driven decision-making and policy formulation to enhance child health outcomes globally.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes	
<b>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.</b>	Abstract is comprehensive included all the necessary points by avoiding redundancy	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in terms of the methodology and analysis used.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	References are sufficient	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I noticed that the results section could benefit from better organization, as some of the presented results appear somewhat disjointed. Additionally, in the introduction, references are made to Table 1 and Table 2, but these tables are not included in the manuscript. It would be helpful to ensure that all referenced materials are provided and the results are presented in a clearer and more structured manner	

#### 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>
<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>K. P. Suresh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ICAR- NIVEDI, India</b>