

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102637
Title of the Manuscript:	SPATIO-TEMPORAL VARIABILITY AND TREND ANALYSIS OF GROUNDWATER LEVELS IN KALPATHYPUZHA SUB-BASIN OF BHARATHAPUZHA, KERALA
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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript could be important for the scientific community to bring in an intervention that will lead to effective management and development of water resources in the process of policy formulation or review as well as formulation of regulations and strategies for water conservation. 2. The title needs to be reworked a little bit to make it short and catchy to avoid confusion as observed by the author in the first page and in the Conclusion Section. Basing on the confusion that is already there, I would, therefore, propose that the title reads as follows "TREND ANALYSIS OF GROUNDWATER LEVELS IN KALPATHYPUZHA SUB-BASIN OF BHARATHAPUZHA, KERALA IN INDIA". The first part of the suggested title by the author "SPATIO-TEMPORAL VARIABILITY AND TREND ANALYSIS" could be used to come up with the aim or specific objective(s) of the study if it's in order. 3. The abstract has attempted to cover some of the tangible key facts/points like summary of the findings and methodology but has been silent on the importance of the study, challenges and proposed way forward, just to mention a few. 4. The structure of the manuscript appears to be a traditional one and is in order. I, however, feel that there has been a mixture of facts in the Sections of Introduction, Results & Discussion and Method and Materials. Consider reworking/rearranging the information in these three sections. For example, the information on the study area could be under introduction. 5. Basing on the available data and facts presented, I feel it's scientifically correct. Some facts presented were observed to be difficult to tell/establish the message and there are some facts that need to be backed with facts and data to make an informed judgement. Avoid short sentences that cannot connect the dots or making sense as well as repetition of facts. Comments in track changes of the document may help the Author in some cases. 6. Note that some of the facts presented in the document need to be backed up by references and this has been mentioned in the track changes of the document. <p>All the 12 references on the list of references have been used in the document, however, there are two references used in the document that are not on the list. These references are"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goyal et al., 2010 in the sub-section 3.2 and line number 7; and • Halder et al., 2020 in sub-section 3.5 and last sentence <p>Good format of presenting the conclusion part needs to be reviewed and reworked to clear the confusion on the title and other information that is not necessary and relevant and not consistent with what has been provided for in the whole document. Note that a Conclusion is supposed to summarise the report as a whole, drawing inferences from the whole process about what has been found in line with the objective of the study, or decided, and the impact of those findings or decisions.</p> <p>All the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols should be written in full followed by the abbreviations/acronyms themselves when they appear in the document for the first time, thereafter, the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols can be used.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	Consider numbering all the Sections including the reference Section or adding page numbers for easy referencing.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The answer could be no as well as yes and comments have been made to this regard in the main document and please refer to the comments in track changes. Consider using words or phrases that are scientifically and professionally correct e.g. seen. Proofreading of the whole document to correct the grammar, typos, tenses etc including rephrasing/reconstruction of some sentences, mixing issues/facts, as well as taking out repeated statements.	
Optional/General comments	Consider reviewing the title of the study as proposed or otherwise to make it short, catchy and not confusing Consider coming up with the aim or objective of the study from the original title formulated. Rework on the Introduction that is too short and lacking important information should come from the section on Methods and Materials. Comments have been made under all the 3 segments/sections, namely; the compulsory, minor and optional/general sections. I feel the manuscript could be under the minor revision range as most of the facts presented need to be corrected/revised if considered to be making sense by the Author. All in all, the manuscript needs to be repaired basing on the deficiencies, some of which have been mentioned in addition to the track changes provided in the attached document may be of help to the author. It is a good study that can help in the management and development water as a resource that plays an important role in the development of the country as well as welfare of the people. Note that there is a need to provide more details to the study and this should include the problems/challenges as well as the proposed way forward based on the experience generated from the study and other studies done in the region and beyond as evidenced by the references included.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	James Peaches Phiri
Department, University & Country	Malawi