

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_104713</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Statistical Model for annual trends and Magnitude of climatic variability across Locations from the Malwa Plateau agroclimatic zone of Madhya Pradesh</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I believe that the manuscript's objective holds value, given the significant influence of climate change on a global scale in various manners. Additionally, the study of precipitation's role is paramount due to its direct connection with food production.</li> <li>2. It appears that the title might not be fully aligned with the manuscript's objective. While the manuscript focuses on precipitation, the title suggests a connection to climatic variability.</li> <li>3. The readability of the article and abstract is hindered by the noticeable limitations in English spelling and language usage. It is evident that the manuscript requires substantial English correction to ensure a proper review process.</li> <li>4. The various sections of the manuscript appear to lack optimal clarity and cohesiveness. The introduction lacks the necessary depth in background and references. Similarly, the methodology section requires more comprehensive explanations. The Results and Discussion section provides some insight into the climatic aspects of precipitation; however, the abundance of tables without thorough discussion hampers the interpretation of the information presented. Figure 2 is mentioned but not shown in text. I think some tables can be changed into Figures in order to clarify. The introduction should discuss the background of the subject, focusing on the aim of the study, and should include the rationale for the importance of the work, supported by updated references. The conclusions provide a list of the results. They should be written considering the main findings and their relationship with the state of the art. The discussion of the results and the conclusions need to be much more refined, compared with other studies. Fig. 1 is referred to as Pic. 1 in the caption. The caption is not self-explanatory.</li> <li>5. The conceptual framework applied to derive results is acceptable; nevertheless, their presentation is convoluted. Furthermore, the method of presenting results within the paper is not facilitating comprehension.</li> <li>6. The references employed in the manuscript are noticeably outdated and should be updated to provide a more current scholarly foundation. Some of the listed references are not mentioned and described in the text.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>NO. The level of English proficiency falls below the anticipated standard, rendering the article challenging to comprehend.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript needs much more refinement to be suitable for publication in a journal. While the topic is valuable, the presentation is unclear, and the writing is inadequate. The result should be more discussed</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Marisa Cogliati</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional del Comahue, Argentina</b>