

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97668
Title of the Manuscript:	Rainfall Analysis at District Level For Crop Planning In North Karnataka A Case Study Of Dharwad district
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:

(<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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. This manuscript is helpful to the agriculture preparedness. However, some revisions are expected: A. a bit more details about the raw data – for example, are there missing values? If so, how was it handled? B. briefly address how the seasonal and monthly data were transformed? C. in the 'methodology' section, add the model(s) applied / performed 2. Yes 3. Yes in general. 4. line spacing for subtitle should be consistent 5. it should be correct as long as the assumptions for the model fitting are satisfied 6. Curious: was the 2020 Anonymous' "Package of Practices" peer reviewed?	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The author(s) should read through this manuscript carefully: A. revise the highlighted parts accordingly; B. correct the typos, such as extra space, inconsistent abbreviation: serial correlation coefficient (SCC) and undefined abbreviated terms: SWMS, NEMS, etc.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mingzeng Sun
Department, University & Country	State University of New York, USA