

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_74672
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact and variability of meteorological parameters on rice crop at Siddharthnagar, Uttar Pradesh, India
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors investigate the effect of the change of the meteorological parameters on the rice growth and yields at Siddharthnagar, Uttar Pradesh. The topic itself is interesting and fits clearly into the scope of the journal. In my view, however, the manuscript is not ready for publication yet as it needs some major corrections before publishing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The author(s)' names and affiliations are missing. 2) I feel the manuscript needs language proofing because there are some sentences that are misunderstandable. 3) In the materials and methods part the special methods have to be described in the past tense. For example "Daily station weather data was utilized for identification of mean spatial patterns and rainfall intensity trends" 4) In the Results and Discussion part the text is not related to the tables. For example the 0.3°C year-1 trend rate from June to October cannot be seen in the Table 1. 5) "SMW" (standard meteorological week) in Table 2 and in Table 4 should be defined in the text. 6) The correlation between rainfall and the stage of the crop is demonstrated in Table 4 and not in Table 3. 7) The conclusion cannot be exactly the same as the abstract. The abstract should contain information about the main conclusion of the study but the text cannot be the same as the conclusion part of the manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beáta Szabó-Takács
Department, University & Country	Global Change Research Institute CAS, Czech Republic