

[Review Form 3](#)

Book Name:	Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3907
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON CROPPING PATTERN AND LAND USE PATTERN IN RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT: USING MARKOV CHAIN APPROACH
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript was current issue and very interesting which plays a key role in agricultural improvements through analysing the impacts of climate change on crop and land use pattern in the study area which provide clue for stockholders for future management action on every existing challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It need modification by omitting extra sentence to readers confusion as follows: Impacts of climate change on crop and land use pattern Ramanathapuram district: using markov chain approach or markov chain approach based climate change impact analysis on crop and land use pattern in Ramanathapuram distric.	
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 abstracts lacks: short explanation about impacts of climate change on crop and land use on the first line <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No clear method and data source - At the end you have to add your recommendation based on your finding - Generally, it is better if it rewrite again due its many grammatical error and the likes. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Scientifically very poor due to: 1. The introduction lacks clear research gap; very few citation; no explanation about marckov chain approach for climatechange impact analysis crop and land use pattern. 2. The methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there were no any description about the study area including; area coverage, geographical locations, temperature, rainfall conditions, physical soil charactristcs, known crop types and maps of the study area as the minimum requirements. -additionally, there were no clear data and datasource for impact analysis which were the mandatory -also you try to raise that used used marckove chain approach techniques, you didn't explain what marckove mean? Why and you applied it for impact analysis clearly for the reader as the author. -you also simply listed extra formula without detail explanaiton. 3. On the result parts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -you have report your novelty only according to your methodological orders explanation, but you filled with discussion. -you also reported many results without any cited table or figures about your results. - generally, the ways of your result explanation was not attractive and required a detail editon again as the comments forwarded to you. 4. Discussion; where is your discussion to express about the strength or weekness of your study as compared to the past scholars. 5. Conclusion; this didn't looks like a conclusion rather than the tittle due to the following case: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -too short and talks some what about the method -lacks any recommendation based on your finding. For every conserved body for future conservation practice. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	-Too few as compared to the tittle acceptance degree -you need to add another reference specially in the introduction and discussion parts again. -re-arrange it alphabetically according to the journals guidelines	

[Review Form 3](#)

:	- add their year of publications, volume; issue, page number, journal name to some of the reference you used for example; on reference list number 3,6, 11,17 and the else.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	poor in grammer explanation techniques and must to re-write again.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mengistu Muleta Gurmessa
Department, University & Country	Wollega University, Ethiopia