



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_44429
Title of the Manuscript:	A Classification Study of Rain Fall Oscillation in Tamil Nadu with Effect of Agricultural Product Import
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Introduction</i> is not focusing on the exact specific problem of debate in space and time, but on rather miscellanea global problems. Please revise.</li> <li>- There is no <i>Methodology</i> section describing how the rainfall values were grouped in three clusters for each year (2007-2013).</li> <li>- Tables have no explanatory notes regarding to the cluster types (1 – low?, 2 – moderate?, 3 – high?), especially that heir order differ from one year to another.</li> <li>- Table <i>Discriminant</i> is roughly presenting sheer figures, without any explanatory notes.</li> <li>- Relationship between rainfall grouping and agri-export or import outputs is rather schematic. Moreover, there is no explanation concerning to how data in Table between lines 208-209 were obtained.</li> <li>- Please indicate on Figure regarding Agri-export and Import what do figures on both axes represent (tons ?).</li> <li>- A more thorough revision of the English language would also be advisable.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Warning: line 24 - Pressure is a meteorological parameter, not a climate parameter. Please correct accordingly.</li> <li>- Lines 81-82 are repeated in lines 94-95, 105-106, 115-116, 127-128, 140-141, 153-154,</li> <li>- Lines 86-89 are almost identical with lines 98-101, 109-112, 120-123, 131-134, 145-148, 158-161, but for the year and the name of the cluster type.</li> </ul> <p>Such dry text repetitions reflect some deficiencies of interpretation. Therefore, more comprehensive explanations and interpretations are highly recommended.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The present study is interesting but still far from conveying a clear idea about what the authors really wanted to demonstrate. Therefore, they are kindly advised to revise the whole article accordingly, by giving more detailed information about their methods and by proportionally correlating the two envisaged components of the study.	

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



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Ionac Nicoleta</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University Of Bucharest, Romania</i></b>