



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Review in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_50869
Title of the Manuscript:	A 19-Years Period (2000-2018) Dataset of Annual and Monthly Spatial Distribution of Rainfall and Average Air Temperature in a Temperate Region for Climate Change Studies
Type of the Article	9. Data Notes

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	<p>The paper A 19-Years Period (2000-2018) Dataset of Annual and Monthly Spatial Distribution of Rainfall and Average Air Temperature in a Temperate Region for Climate Change Studies is interesting. However, it would be even better if the following issues are taken into account:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page layout is incorrect and cramped 2. The paper does not sufficiently describe the methodology 3. Add more details on methods and materials are required and need the reference to the statistical processing of data. Several experiments (repetitions) and statistics of the results are not clear. 4. Extending the conclusions – what are the additional topics that required for review 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page layout of manuscript has been reviewed. 2. Details about the methodology have been added in the revised manuscript 3. No particular statistical processing has been applied to data. Maps were generated starting from cumulative rainfall (sum of 15-minute precipitation data) and average air temperature. Also the maps presented in the manuscript as figures were obtained through simple arithmetic mean. 4. The "Conclusion" section has been added to the revised manuscript. As the paper is of type "Data Note", it represents a description of a scientific dataset without including analyses or particular data processing.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	