

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_93671
Title of the Manuscript:	Trend analysis and ARIMA models for water quality parameters of Brahmani River
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I have not major revision comments	
Minor REVISION comments	In my opinion, the work presented is a representation of bona fide empirical research in the field of hydrology. The article has all the signs of scientific research: object, goal, hypothesis, research data and qualified statistical processing of empirical data. However, it is necessary to note some remarks from the point of view of setting the problem. Yes, it was quite correct to set a statistical problem in the Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average paradigm. However, why are each of the components of water quality considered independently? The reviewer is not an expert in hydrology, but the corpus of publications he has studied on this topic indicates that there is a correlation between water quality values. In this case, the formulation of the problem looks somewhat simplified and not fully substantiated. In my opinion, it was more correct to formulate the problem as VAR.	
Optional/General comments	I would also like to comment on the choice of water quality variables in Brahmani River. More than a dozen indicators of water quality appear in the scientific literature. Why are there only four of them in the paper presented?	

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:	Leonid Galchynsky
Department, University & Country	Igor Sikorsky National Technical University of Ukraine, Ukraine