

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_110740
Title of the Manuscript:	Meteorological drought trend analysis in northern Karnataka
Type of the Article	Research article

[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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The author discussed the analysis of meteorological drought data in 12 districts of northern Karnataka state. This analysis is done using the Mann-Kendall (MK) trend test and the Sen slope estimator. Based on the objectives reported by this study, it can be said that this work is of great scientific importance especially from an environmental perspective.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is appropriate, because the author has made a specific case study.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is complete since the author gave an overview on the methodology and another on the results obtained, going through the expected objectives.</p> <p>4. The sub-sections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, since for author followed the conventional flowchart of the construction of a scientific article.</p> <p>5. I cannot confirm that the manuscript is scientifically correct, because the author has not justified his results by a numerical validation.</p> <p>6. The totality of references is not sufficient and all the recent references are also not sufficient.</p> <p>I point out that the article requires the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • validation of the results obtained for greater credibility; • More bibliography reference to strengthen objectives and results. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the linguistic/English quality of the article is suitable for scientific communications</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	The article requires slight revision, as previously stated	

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:	Oudrane Abdellatif
Department, University & Country	The African University Ahmed Draia of Adrar, Algeria