



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_45035
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling Quarterly Agricultural Gross Domestic Product Data of Kenyan Economy using Time Series
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors should greatly enhance the literature review as well as the structure of the paper and the conclusion section. The selected model presents better aic value when compared to the other models. However the RMSE and MAPE errors are high, thus overall the selected model does not perform well, can you explain this? I also suggest the usage of the Mean Absolute Error instead of the MAPE	Improved the literature review (page 2 paragraph 3). Also enhanced the structure. Also improved the conclusion. The values considered were in millions (large values) as seen on page 5, first line under results and discussion. Thus the difference between the forecasted value and the original may give a somehow high which may result into high RMSE and MAE values. Also, table 6 shows that the forecasted values are within the confidence intervals when compared with the actual values. MAE was used instead of MAPE: table 1 page 8, table 4b page 10.
Minor REVISION comments	Some proof editing must be performed	Proof editing was done.
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	