

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Research Journal of Agriculture |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARJA_114626 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Non-parametric Methodologies to Analyse the Trend in Rainfall of North Interior Karnataka (NIK) Meteorological Subdivision of Karnataka |
| Type of the Article | Research article |

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>1. The manuscript is relatively important.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Add a subsection about the limitation of the study, and future related research.</p> <p>5. With some corrections, as suggested also below, the manuscript cab be considered scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references primarily do not comprise recent publications.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | Regarding scholarly discourse, the language employed is comparatively appropriate. Certain adjustments, typically pertaining to terms that begin with a capital letter within a sentence, are required. | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | Discuss more how your findings compare to existing literature. Address any agreements, discrepancies, or contradictions. Analyze whether your results support or challenge established theories or prior research. Acknowledge the limitations of your study. Suggest avenues for future research based on the insights gained from your study. Examine the practical implications of your study's results. | |

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Orgeta Gjermëni |
| Department, University & Country | University of Vlora "Ismail Qemali", Albania |