

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_110760
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on Variability of Rainfall over North - Eastern Dry Zone of Karnataka: a statistical analysis
Type of the Article	scientist

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>The article raises the importance of studying the variations that precipitation can have in situations of climate change.</p> <p>The title Studies on Variability of Rainfall over North - Eastern Dry Zone of Karnataka: a statistical analysis is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract is adequate and describes the problem with the precipitation.</p> <p>The structure is appropriate.</p> <p>The paper is correct.</p> <p>The references is adequate.</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 article is written in English suitable for the topic developed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It would be advisable to incorporate some figure with monthly rainfall to be able to appreciate the variability within the year. It would be interesting if it is clarified what the hydrological year of the region is like. The study is proposed in calendar years, it would be appropriate to indicate why the study was proposed this way. Regarding the conclusions, it would be interesting if a greater depth was made between the title, the summary and the work presented. In the conclusions it would be interesting to incorporate how what was observed would affect the issue of rainfed agriculture, which is the main point of the article. In the text it is indicated that the statistical analysis of monthly rainfall was carried out and is presented in tables 1-8 of APPENDIX - I but the appendix is not in the document sent</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Teresa Reyna
Department, University & Country	National University of Cordoba, Argentina