



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_45035
Title of the Manuscript:	Modelling 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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		
Minor REVISION comments	Minor proofreading: [1] Abstract Second line, write... has a significant role and contribution to GDP. [2] Whenever there is citation number, remove the dot before it. Example, page 2, write... Growth rate [1]. At a specific time t [4]. Check all paper.... [3] Page 3, move the citation number [4], shown after equation 4, till after differencing [4]. [4] Page 4, first paragraph after equation (8), second line... write... either weekly, quarterly.... [5] Page 4, first paragraph after equation (8), 11th line, write... use of SARIMA models is not evident. [6] Page 5, add spacing before (AIC)... [7] Page 6, paragraph under Figure 2, 6th line, write... result is shown in... [8] Review your references writing carefully; Example Vol(Issue), 12(4), ... Is written with comma, colon,.... And check spacings...	
Optional/General comments	In general, very good and attractive subject. The author(s) were very clear in their research plan. The abstract is adequate The introduction is good, streamlined and clear The literature review is satisfactory to tie the title, the abstract and the literature itself and to the discussions. The methodology is good and the paper's plan is clear The discussion accompanied by the supporting arguments and cited authors and official documents is satisfactory. However, the author has to add the implications for policy makers? Minor Proofreading is needed References need careful review ...	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Hussin Jose Hejase</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Al Maaref University, Lebanon</i>