

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_115368
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Standardization of a Climate Vulnerability Index to Measure the Vulnerability Indices of Paddy Growers
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rather interesting study and its analysis and results. Do provide the changes of current data for the past few years on the production of paddy in India and the changes in the climate over the years that may be due to global warming over the years across the globe etc. This is to provide a clearer current scenario and the current problem faced in the agriculture industry in India. • Provide the data illustrating the importance of agriculture industry in India. • Need to review critically the current past studies pertaining to the scope of this study, it could be from other countries or/and other states in India etc. • Also need to have past studies on the weights of indicators (monsoon vulnerability, Precipitation variability, climate hazard etc) as well as other aspects in this methodological section • The methodological part is written in a rather clear and consistent manner but lack of reasons for each of the decision make in this aspect. Eg. the chosen indicators, sub-indicators etc) • Interpret and explain the results obtained for ease of understanding rather than merely reporting and stating the results without much interpretation. • Also results presented in tables-form need to be explained and do highlight the important key points of the results in the tables presented) • The conclusion is TOO brief and not much on how the results of this study can be used by various stakeholders to narrow the current research gap (which should have been identified in the problem statement/ background of the study/ introduction) • Ensure that all the citations used in the content are listed consistently using the needed format. Need to ensure that the citations in the content are align with the references list. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chiam CC
Department, University & Country	Malaysia