



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_20497
Title of the Manuscript:	Modern Warming In Middle Asia As Atmospheric Circulation Change Development
Type of the Article	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:

(<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 aims of this paper is to determine the beginning of the current warming in middle Asia and study trends in atmospheric circulation based on interannual changes of synoptic processes duration in Middle Asia over the last 60 years. In my opinion the results of this paper is still in its very preliminary version. Additionally, serious speculation is observed in the text. I highlighted one here used in the text: "Increase in weather vapor, not in carbon dioxide emissions in Uzbekistan, were many times less than emissions in the other countries". In this case there is a information which can't be observed from the paper results. The methodology description of the paper is very poor and useless. It must follow scientific and technical standard to facilitate the reproduction by readers/researches. In my opinion the methodology must be completely re-done. There are no discussions in the results section. The authors just describe the figures but they do not refer old results, which could corroborate or not their findings. It's easy to leave the responsibility to interpretation to the readers, but in a scientific journal it must be done by the authors. In line 74 the authors affirm that the warming in the	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Uzbekistan begins in 60s of the twenty century, but where we can find it in their results. There are no graphs showing such an explanation. In line 82 the authors supposedly analysed the standard precipitation index for cold and warm half of the years, but nothing is presented in the text, as figures, for example. It would facilitate the revision's task. In the conclusions section the authors affirm that the annual rainfall slight increases in Uzbekistan from 60-ies, but they have affirmed that the anticyclonic duration processes, which inhibit precipitation, have increased. How do they could explain this? I believe the annual rainfall must decrease under an increase of anticyclonic processes. Their explanation support the idea the air masses originating in Middle Asia have become wetter. But, this is not shown in the paper. The authors once again use other findings to support their results without the care of showing their own findings, when affirm about the increasing in water vapor. Unfortunately, I suggest the rejection of the paper as it presents serious scientific and technical deficiencies. But, as there is a great interest in such topic, I do not discard better future improvements and re-submission to this journal.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	University of the Amazonas State, Brazil