

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_122549
Title of the Manuscript:	IDENTIFICATION OF MUTATION POINT AND TREND ANALYSIS OF AREA, PRODUCTION AND YIELD OF WHEAT CROP IN GUJARAT
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a good paper with considerable novelty regarding trend analysis. As long as I know, it includes novelty and I believe can be a good paper for publication. However, I suffered from language and clarity. It needs to be revised by a native person or at least get revised by someone expert in English. Please do that so that your paper can be seen in the future.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I am not very happy with the mutation point. I have no specific suggestions but you may have another look at it. Also, the title words should not be written in the keywords. Make sure to use different words for these two sections.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The objective is written and is very good, but you must write a sentence about why you have this objective.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Sure. They are correct. But maybe the methods and materials could be extended and provide more information. You may use appendix for this part.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The idea and novelty of the paper is significant. The tests are very scientific and are used in daily publication and research. The length of the study is considered long-term and so, you can trust it statistically. Also, the results make sense and the description about them are correct meaning the results are suitable for a robust paper.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	<p>The references are very limited. I highly suggest to cite this article at least as the changes of the hydrological changes. Please let me know if you disagree. Moghim, S., Takallou, A. An integrated assessment of extreme hydrometeorological events in Bangladesh. <i>Stoch Environ Res Risk Assess</i> 37, 2541–2561 (2023). <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-023-02404-5">https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-023-02404-5</a></p> <p>These are also my papers that are close to this paper. As a reviewer, I am not suggesting any of them, but think they are very related and so, I am providing some idea regarding them. If the author thinks these two are related, you can use them. Ramezani Etedali, H., Adabi, V., Gorgin, F. <i>et al.</i> The probabilistic behavior of AquaCrop parameters: a Monte-Carlo study. <i>Stoch Environ Res Risk Assess</i> 37, 717–734 (2023). <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-022-02309-9">https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-022-02309-9</a></p> <p>Gorgin Paveh, F., Ramezani Etedali, H. &amp; Collins, B. Evaluation of CRU TS, GPCC, AgMERRA, and AgCFSR meteorological datasets for estimating climate and crop variables: A case study of maize in Qazvin Province, Iran. <i>J. Arid Land</i> 14, 1361–1376 (2022). <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s40333-022-0108-7">https://doi.org/10.1007/s40333-022-0108-7</a></p>	

**Review Form 3**

<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The whole text need a slight checking for grammar and words used. Authors mentioned using ChatGPT, I suggest using an expert human, or using an AI that is related to grammar such as Grammarly.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please provide some information regarding the test and trends used in the paper. For instance, what is Mann-Kendal and how did you use it? You should do that for other methods and materials.  I am not sure if the period mentioned in the conclusion is correct.  There are many tables and no figures. Please use figures instead of the tables. Also, please use a figure for the location of the study area.	

**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>Faraz Gorginpaveh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Alabama, United States</b>