

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_127416
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating Rainfall Patterns in South Singhbhum: A Non-Parametric Approach Utilizing Mann-Kendall Tests and Sen's Slope Estimator
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is extremely important to understand the rainfall pattern however, there is a significant lack in the manuscript 1. Manuscript must highlight research gap properly. 2. The research should adhere with valid explanations. 3. Authors must double check equations before write it in the manuscript. 4. The manuscript should incorporate seasonal fluctuations, 5. A proper discussion section should be added. 6. A specific conclusion is needed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is nice but the title should be accompanied with relevant explanations.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. More detailed result section is needed.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. Manuscript must highlight research gap properly. 2. The research should adhere with valid explanations. 3. Authors must double check equations before write it in the manuscript. 4. The manuscript should incorporate seasonal fluctuations, 5. A proper discussion section should be added. A specific conclusion is needed	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Need more citations and references in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of English language should be furnished.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Shrinwantu Raha
Department, University & Country	Bhairab Ganguly College, India