



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_56002
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of State Space Models with Weather as Exogenous Input for Sugarcane Yield Prediction in Haryana
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 1. Introduction 2. Method 3. Result and Discussion 4. Conclusion	1. Introduction: No problem statement in introduction. Please explain the object and purpose of the research on introduction 2. Method. Please check the template about Literature Review and Method. Both of them should be separated or combined. Method has to mention what is the research type, how to get the data and information, and flow process how to do the research. 3. Result and discussion just show the table but doesn't explain in every table and graph. 4. No conclusion on the manuscript. Even though the research to be continued has to write what is current conclusion and what is the next step should be done.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Abstract 2. Reference	1. Abstract: please mention the reason of method selection on the abstract and what is the result of that method by numerical result or percentage 2. Reference. If look at to the citation on Method (current manuscript), it's APA Style, but Bibliography on reference doesn't sort from A to Z	
Optional/General comments		



[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>Teguh Sri Ngadono</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University Of Mercu Buana Jakarta, Indonesia</i>