

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_101379
Title of the Manuscript:	Creating Antalya Drought Map And Associating It With Agricultural Lands
Type of the Article	Scientific

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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>According to the research work done, it cannot be considered a scientific manuscript. Because there are many scientific and even written shortcomings in it. The title of the article should be chosen correctly and scientifically to attract the reader to read the article. Which is not seen in this article. It would have been better if the title was written like this: Investigating climatic drought and its relationship with agricultural lands (case study: Antalya, Turkey). The abstract of the article does not match the title and work and is very poorly written. The sub-sections of the article could be written better with proper scientific and written order and structure. That is very poorly written. Which shows the author's impatience. From a scientific point of view, the manuscript is not correct in any way. It must be rewritten. References are few and old. I request the respected author to study more in this field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The structure of the text in English is very weak. It shows the author's lack of correct understanding of the case.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali Mohamadpour Zeidi
Department, University & Country	Kharazmi University of Tehran, Iran