

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_109530
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparative analysis of the climate patterns of Cumilla District with different regions of Bangladesh: A Study of Temperature and Rainfall Trends
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. In the present global climate change context, the study “A comparative analysis of the climate patterns of Cumilla District with different regions of Bangladesh: A Study of Temperature and Rainfall Trends” is very interest and important for Scientific community.</p> <p>The tile of the study is clearly reflected and suitable for the analysis of the study.</p> <p>No. It needs to be modified.</p> <p>Yes. It is appropriate the structure of the manuscript. But large modifications are required with more clarity.</p> <p>Ye, The manuscript Scientifically correct. But needs to be provide supporting discussion with related references.</p> <p>Yes. It needs to be added supportive references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The major editing of the language is required to improve the quality of the manuscript for possible publication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The sentence “Different statistical techniques such as Linear regression, Mann-Kendall (MK) test, Sen’s Slope estimator and Kendall’s tau test were discovered for trend analysis of the study area” is not clear. Have you discovered these methods by you? Or were these methods used to conduct trend analysis over this region? What are the reasons the amount of rainfall that fell each year in Ishwardi, and Cumilla was going down but is going up in Cox's Bazar. Is there any local effect? The abstract is needs to be modify with more quantitative results. Please correct the sentence” This country's economy is heavily based on the farming industry, and about 80% people depend directly or indirectly on primary economic activity. (Kamruzzaman et al., 2018). The “findingsshowed” should be “findings showed”. The sentence ‘Their findingsshowed that annual rainfall was forecasted to decline by 153 mm between 2011 and 2020.’ Is not clear. Is it forecast?. The sentence “Basak et al. (2013) found that the yearly average maximum temperature was increasing at 0.0186°C per year, while the minimum temperature was increasing per year at 0.0152°C.” needs to be modify. “decreasesin” should be “decrease in” “andtheir” should be “and their” ‘toexamine’ should be “to examine” “trendsin”, should be “trends in”. The gaps and need of present study not addressed properly. The average annual temperature of the area is 25.5 °C (77.9 °F) and annually 2,295 mm (90.35 in) of precipitation falls. (Banglapedia, 2003). In most places citations are not positioned properly. Figure 1 is not cited in the text. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>15. "Different statistical technique has been implemented for required analysis and this are described in the following sections. General exploratory statistical analysis such as maximum, minimum, mean/ average, median, standard deviation has been applied to present the general characteristic of temperature data. What about Rainfall?</p> <p>16. The Table 1 is not arranged properly.</p> <p>17. Fig. 2 is not clear. It is confusing. Please replot it with proper text without confusing. For example " month wise Maximum and Minimum values of Maximum and Minimum Temperatures.</p> <p>18. Same confusion on Figure 3 and 4. Please Replot with more clarity.</p> <p>19. The Fig.5 and 6 are confusing? It looks like time series but caption indicates long-term average.</p> <p>20. Figure 7 is confusing. What is the means by Frequency curve for average (max + min) temperature of all three stations?. Figure 7 looks like monthly mean values of temperature for three stations.</p> <p>21. Not mentioned about Rainfall in the methodology.</p> <p>22. All Figure captions needs to be modified with more clear including with period.</p> <p>23. The conclusion needs to be rewrite with quantitative results.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Murali Nageswara Rao Malasala
Department, University & Country	USA