

## 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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b>NO. we need to add the comments I highlighted for it to be comprehensive and point to the objectives.</b></p> <p>Yes, but we need to add sections on data collection and data analysis for studies of this nature.</p> <p>Yes, its scientifically proper.</p> <p>The references are only 12 and they are not enough, I have suggested in my review comments in the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Its fair for scholarly communication</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The author(S) should consider the comments I raised and once addressed, I think the paper can be stronger and attain its intended impact and add something to the existing scientific body of knowledge and address the pertinent issues it is raising within the study area.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Itai Dhlwayo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Wildlife and Environmental Sciences, Chinhoyi University of Technology, Zimbabwe</b>