



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15876
Title of the Manuscript:	Oceanic Niño Index as a tool to determine, in advance, the effect of rain on coffee cultivation in Colombia
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The main critics are that the maps of correlation do not allow distinguishing what are the statistically significant correlations from those that are not. All correlations are presented but there is no way to understand what the significant correlations are. The presentation should be changed to be much more meaningful and understandable (suggestion: square for negative and round for positive and triangle for non significant..? with level of greys for importance of the correlation..?). As those maps are the main part of the paper, this point is essential. The analyzed variable was the number of days with rain per month and a rainy day was determined as that record of daily precipitation equals or exceeding 0.1 mm. It should be explained why this variable was chosen and not (instead or in addition) the total rainfall per month? Reference should be given for similar approach that was successfully used in coffee or other crops... The discussion is unclear and extremely short. It should be better structured and deal clearly with several points of interest in relation with the literature. Part of the conclusion should be placed in the discussion while the conclusion should summarize clearly the whole study and the clear conclusions that it brings to the reader.	We accept the recommendation and Also make changes in the maps typographical errors and conventions. The cumulative rainfall was not included in the study because it will be part of another study already is advancing. We accept the suggestion and discussion expanded based on other studies. We accept the recommendation and included the conclusion as part of the discussion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The time series span over different periods. It should be indicated if there has been no change overtime of the rainfall seasonality? In this case, the use of different period is OK while if this is not the case, it would be advised to use only the same periods even if some stations should be left out.	We cannot make the change, because in principle would change the entire document.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No analysis was done with a delay between the ONI and the rainfall? It can happen that correlation can be stronger with weeks or months of delay. Methods could indicate if this was done or discussion could mention this aspect for further investigation ...	Delay between the ONI and the rainfall was not included in the study because it will be part of another study already is advancing.