



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_46730
Title of the Manuscript:	Time Series Analysis and Forecasting of Oilseeds Production in India – An Application of ARIMA and GMDH-Neural Network
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	<p>The number of keywords should be reduced to a maximum of five The goals and objectives of the paper should be clearly stated Under 3.1, which year was the data uploaded and what is the proper reference for the data?</p> <p>Table titles should appear above the table not below</p> <p>Extend the forecast from the models to 2025 so as to give time for policy changes based on the analysis</p> <p>The demonstration of the differences between ARIMA and GMDH is not sufficient. In addition, the graph of the fitted values should be shown.</p> <p>Fig. 5 and 6 should be made clearer, probably by increasing the size Additional comments indicated on the manuscript.</p>	<p>Number of keywords has been reduced from 7 to 5 Objective of the study is mentioned in section 3. Now 3.1 has been changed into 4.1 and link of the data source has been inserted in the manuscript which is (http://eands.dacnet.nic.in/latest_20011.htm) Title of Table 6 and Table 7 have been placed above the table The authors agree with reviewer's comment regarding extension of the forecast time, but short run forecasting is more accurate than long run forecasting. The study considers forecast of 5 years period for the sake of accuracy in forecasting. The graph of the fitted values in both model are included in the manuscript</p> <p>The size of Fig 5 and Fig 6 have been increased.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
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)	