

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_86710
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction of rainfall pattern using Holt winters method in Bungoma County, Western Kenya
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:

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

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	<p>Introduction should specify the main problem and objective clearly. The article only displayed the problems and previous studies, but the stated objective in the abstract is not included in the main body of the research. Specify the objective clearly. I also see that the problem background is not clear, I cannot understand what problem are you trying to point out since you only give summaries of previous research and rainfall condition.</p> <p>From the figure 3 and figure 4, there is no clear distinction of the point of the discussion. It should be clear on: what is the use for Figure 3 according to the objective of the research, the same goes with Figure 4, what is the correlation for Figure 4 to the objectives. The discussion should reflect to the objective of the study.</p> <p>What is the implication of the skewed data from the histogram? Why is it that the conclusion can conclude the months, but the discussion does not mention this?</p> <p>The conclusion should answer the objective of the study. Please revise it.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Images were cropped badly, try to look at the images again before submitting.</p> <p>Rounding numbers to around 4 to 5 numbers after the decimal point might be better</p> <p>Histogram should be positioned better, please change the axis name</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Check your English transcript because some of the sentences are not grammatically clear</p>	

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:	Fathiyah Hakim Sagitaningrum
Department, University & Country	University of Indonesia, Indonesia