

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_97865</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An MRA Based MLR Model for Forecasting Indian Annual Rainfall Using Large Scale Climate Indices</b>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community, I see that the manuscript is very important and provides good results that are very interesting for the scientific community. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the manuscript too short has to include between 150-250 words. 4. I see that the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are not well placed, see my proposals placed in the manuscript. 5. I see that this manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent, the part of the references is quite rich, is mixing between old and recent references.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. I see that yes, the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	- All comments and recommendations are placed in the text of the manuscript, please check them.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Aziz Benhamrouche</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ferhat Abbas University Setif1, Algeria</b>