

Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JEAI_87641   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Bias correction of climate model outputs in Central Kashmir of Great Himalayas for climate change impact assessment |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article   |

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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>This paper is a report on how to perform bias correction on climate models for climate change impact assessment. The conclusions drawn seem to be important, but the data presented and their explanations are inadequately felt by the judges. I will describe the points I noticed below, so please refer to the correction.</p> <p>- It is understandable to some extent that the result of the correction is better than before (if possible, there may be a little more ingenuity in the table and more description in the text). However, it is not known whether the corrected result is sufficient for the impact assessment. Is there a specific value that can be considered, such as how much it should not fluctuate? (Based on previous research)</p> |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>- As described in 3.1.2, it is difficult to evaluate the results simply by increasing / decreasing in such cases. Why don't you add a description that big is good / bad so that even non-specialists can understand it to some extent?</p> <p>- From the figures in Table 3, the reader may not know whether this is sufficient. Is this research underway, or is this enough? It is necessary to increase the text in the discussion section.</p> <p>- Isn't the number "9.64" at the bottom of Table 3 inconsistent with the text? (Isn't it the mistake of "9.63"?)</p>  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |   |   |

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
| <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>Jun Kobayashi</b>              |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Kochi, Japan</b> |