

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103816
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Effect Of Rainfall Variability On Crop Productivity of Tur (Arhar) and Cotton crops for various Districts Of Maharashtra
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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) The manuscript could be important for the scientific community if additional data are provided and more rigor is embraced in statistical analysis and consequently conclusions improved and empowered. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) The title is suitable, but the main words should be capitalized. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but unfortunately, it does not completely stem from the article. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections are appropriate but the same does not apply to their structure. It is not acceptable that a certain subsection contains only tables without any explanation about their content and meaning. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Not really, scientific rigor is missing. This is why there are several GENERAL REMARKS: it is not clear what data were subject to statistical analysis! - Was it the correlation between the rainfall (absolute rainfall) and the crops productivity in tonnes/hectare? - Was it the correlation between the rainfall departure and the crops productivity in tonnes/hectare? Additionally, it is not clear how the statistical parameters such as T-test and Detrending were addressed/used in this study. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. No, the references are to be enlarged. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>English quality is acceptable, but some additional clarifications are needed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>GENERAL REMARKS: it is not clear what data were subject to statistical analysis!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was it the correlation between the rainfall (absolute rainfall) and the crops productivity in tonnes/hectare? - Was it the correlation between the rainfall departure and the crops productivity in tonnes/hectare? <p>Additionally, it is not clear how the statistical parameters such as T-test and Detrending were addressed/used in this study.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Danijel Šugar
Department, University & Country	University of Zagreb, Croatia