

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_78928
Title of the Manuscript:	ARIMA MODEL FOR FORECASTING OF MONTHLY RAINFALL AND TEMPERATURE IN THE LAKE VICTORIA BASIN
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<https://www.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy>)

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	After reviewing the document, it seems to me that the part of the summary, introduction and basic concepts are well written, although it seems that most of it is marked as plagiarism (unless the author is the same person who already published something similar). What seems a little weak to me is the part of the methodology and above all the results, the discussion and the conclusions, it seems to me that more work needs to be done on these aspects so that the contributions of this article are clear. I suggest a review and expansion of the methodology, results, discussion and conclusions.	1. The paper was my research project work at Maseno University in 2016, I have decided to publish it now, so there is no plagiarism. 2. I have worked on the spelling 3. I have improved on the coclusion and reference
Minor REVISION comments	There are some spelling and grammar mistakes.	
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)	