

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101048
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Rainfall and Temperature Trends in Maharashtra State, India: A Spatio-Temporal Analysis
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>)

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. Yes, the manuscript is relevant for the scientific community as it gives information about the current climate and past climate situation allowing to understand what could happen in the future climate of the studied region. The study gives information about what climate issues (drought and/or floods) need to be addressed in terms of the region economic sector adaptation under climate change.</p> <p>2. Yes the title of the article is suitable but I have made some changes. See the changes provided in the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is well structured and well written with a clear conclusion that strengthen the knowledge about climate change and the adaptations options to investigate for the economic sustainability of the studied regions</p> <p>4. Yes the subsections and the structure are adequate but I have made some minor change in the manuscript. See the changes in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct as the authors used a sophisticated method for the evaluation of the rainfall and temperature trends and the problem of the study is clearly established and addressed. The background of the study is clear and the results are very well presented. The conclusion of the study is very clear and relevant for the socioeconomic development and sustainability under climate change of the studied region. However the results need to be discussed deeper and I suggest authors to separate the results and the discussion section. In this regard see the manuscript to address my comments.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references cited in the manuscript are relevant and recent. However, we requested the authors to strictly follow the rules of the journal related to the references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Coulibaly Yacouba Noël
Department, University & Country	Institut de l'Environnement et de Recherches Agricoles, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique, Burkina Faso