Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_97865**
Title of the Manuscript:	**An MRA Based MLR Model for Forecasting Indian Annual Rainfall Using Large Scale Climate Indices**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	Enough. Yes. Sufficiently. Yes. Yes. No.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	Interesting research about linear regression of multiresolution analysis for rainfall predicaiton, and the work is assembled into a decently drafted manuscript that needs some mild revisions. • The manuscript is clear, relevant for the field and presented in a well-structured manner. The cited references are current (some within the last 5 years), while suggested very recently published references are suggested in review to aid revision. The manuscript is scientifically sound, and the experimental design is appropriate to test the hypothesis. The manuscript's results are reproducible based on the details given in the methods section. The figures/tables/images/schemes appropriate and properly show the data. They are easy to interpret and understand. The data is interpreted appropriately and consistently throughout the manuscript. The conclusions are consistent with the evidence and arguments presented. The Abstract is okay but is not likely to entice the readership to continue reading the rest of the manuscript. • Use of acronyms/abbreviations in an abstract is unlikely to attract readers not already aware of the manuscript's content. • Results are only presented in a weak, qualitative fashion. Highest quality expression of main conclusions or interpretations is quantitative results discussed in the broadest context possible, e.g., percent performance improvement compared to a declared benchmark. "…outperformance of the proposed model has been proved…" is very weakly stated results compared to "…xxx percent performance improvement over conventional methods was achieved…." The Introduction is decently done with some omitted very recent literature but lacking abuse of multi-citation without elaboration (no double-citations or triple citations). • Competing alternatives were neglected in the review in favor of older works • Just last march in an already highly cited work, Sandberg proposed several predictive learning algorithms in https://doi.org/10.3390/aerospace9030135.	

	• Shar used the same approach as Sandberg (also based on regression) the year prior applied to prediction of DC motor control: https://doi.org/10.3390/app11114972 Equations are scientifically sound and well presented, enhancing the manuscript quality. Figures are really well done and enhance the manuscript's quality. Tables are decently done to introduce problem formation (aiding repeatability), but quantitative results are neglected. • Particularly for comparative figures, please add a table of accompanying canonical figures of merit (e.g., means and deviations of difference, or others) to help the reader ascertain quantitative differences between the plotted data. • For such a manuscript, heavy in acronym and variable usage, please add period tables of proximal definitions, so the readership is not required to flip back and forth between pages to remind themselves of acronym and variable definitions. • Inclusion of a table defining variables and acronyms in an appendix is welcome and effective. Please add such.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Timothy Sands**
Department, University & Country	**Cornell University, United States of America**