



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_48240
Title of the Manuscript:	Modelling and forecasting of Mung production in India
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Some phrases are not clear 2. Some references are not available. 3. Concepts	1.1 Review Lines 15-17 "Existing and developed measures of sustainability have been used on time series yield data of gram over the major growing states of India to compare the measures as well as the states w.r.t. their yield sustainability" 2.1 Anonymous. (2015). India in business, Investment and technology promotion division, Ministry of external This website is under construction. 3.1 Some concepts as FAC and FACP were not used	1.1 We have removed these lines. 2.1 That time this websites was accessible. 3.1 yes, we have not used . Concepts is to study the sustainability and projection of mung for 2022.
Minor REVISION comments	4. Some phrases are not clear 5. Clarify source 6. Equations are not numbered 7. Some terms are not defined in text 8. Absence of necessary comments	4.1 lakh ha is not common use as an international unit. Consider to make it clear. 5.1 Grubb's test is the one of the most popular ways to define outlier 5.2 Line 62-72 6.1 All equations 7.1 Table 1 : SGR% and CGR% 8.1 Why "Maharashtra is best fitted with higher order ARIMA(4,1,4) model" ? 8.2 Comments of some R2=0,99 obtained.	4.1 modified the lines. 5.1 Yes your right, but here, we are trying to define in own way. The way you're talking already used in our previous published article, so that we have not used here. 6.1 we have not mentioned equation, because already each equation under certain objective, it is clearly and easy to understand. 7.1 SGR = Simple growth rate and compound growth Rate. 8.1 on the basis of selection criteria of model, it best fitted. In analysis so many things done in background, which not possible to present here. 8.2 R2 =0.99, no need of worry with this, because for model selection we used other criteria also.
Optional/General comments	9. It is not clear which software was used	9.1 Specify the software used.	R and SAS used in analysis.



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