



**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	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>)



SDI 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Line 9: put a full stop mark separating the 2 paragraphs:</b> <i>atmospheric dynamics.</i> <i>This research article...</i></p> <p><b>Line 9: change the word: design by distribution</b></p> <p><b>Line 10 and 11: revise the sentences</b></p> <p><b>Line 12: change "in the period" to "For the period"</b></p> <p><b>Lines 14-15: revise the 2 sentences</b></p> <p><b>Lines 16-17: revise the paragraph</b></p> <p><b>Line 19: key words "SPSS, MAT Lab " to be removed because are not indicated in this paper</b></p> <p><b>Line 23: Change "in determine " to « in determining »</b></p> <p><b>Lines 26-27: revise</b> There is a slow and steady increase in the temperature which has a direct impact on rainfall.</p> <p><b>Lines 34-37: please indicate references</b></p> <p><b>Lines 38-39: what is the relation of this paragraph with the rest. Not clear!</b></p> <p><b>Lines 39-41: not true! The Köppen climate classification system doesn't use only</b> Average annual rainfall. Please correct.</p> <p><b>Lines 41-43: nothing to do with the remain section. Please remove it.</b></p> <p><b>Lines 44-45: Please revise the paragraph</b></p> <p><b>Lines 45-46: The temperature has not been studied, therefore, revise this para.</b></p> <p><b>Lines 52-53: Revise the para</b></p> <p><b>Line 54: is it MPR method or MPL method?</b></p> <p><b>Lines 55-56: Rewrite the para</b></p> <p><b>Line 66: change the sentence to: northeast India and parts of Gujarat and Kerala is</b> <b>observed.</b></p> <p><b>Line 67: change "is identifying the pattern" to " is to identify"</b></p> <p><b>Line 68: change the sentence "of all the season of rainfall data" to: the seasonal rainfall</b> <b>data</b></p> <p><b>Lines 121-123: how did you conclude that ?</b></p> <p><b>From line 78 to 197:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The author has to use correctly the classification approach</li> <li>- The author should show proficiency using the classification methods accordingly to the objectives since there is:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a- No comment of the results</li> <li>b- No methodology is indicated.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>My advice:</b></p> <p><b>Revise all the structure of the paper</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Introduce a map indicating the position of the concerned zone and its geographical characteristics.</li> <li>2- Add a methodology section</li> <li>3- Learn how to use effectively the clustering method</li> <li>4- Comment correctly the results</li> <li>5- Add discussion section</li> <li>6- Explain why you introduced import/export of agricultural products and what is its relationship with the classification of the rainfall regimes in the region.</li> <li>7- Why you correlated these both series</li> <li>8- What are the main agricultural products you are indicating?</li> <li>9- Add a conclusion</li> </ol> <p><b>Line 167 and for the whole article: Please change "Rain fall" to "Rainfall "</b></p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Scientifically, the paper needs a serious improvement. The method is not clearly and adequately described. The results not clearly presented. No conclusion in the paper and the language is a bit challenging to understand. The structure of the paper needs a serious improvement.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Salah Sahabi Abed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Office National de la Météorologie (O.N.M), Algeria</b>