

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_118386
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining Two Decades of Climate Variability in Karnataka: Insights from Temperature and Rainfall Trends
Type of the Article	

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Sufficiently to preface the current manuscript.</p> <p>Adequately.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. Neither.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Interesting research about temperature and rainfall trend presentation with mild qualitative analysis. Please make the following revisions anticipating publication recommendation from a favorable Reviewer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is clear, relevant for the field and presented in a well-structured manner. The cited references are not current (less than one third within the last 5 years), while suggested very recently published references are offered optionally to aid revision since the broad field is neglected in favor of too quickly narrowly focusing on the references related to the proposed approaches. 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 (contains typographical errors and a lack of any claim of results other than declarations of the constituent data). Results are only presented in a weak, qualitative fashion. The 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. "...this study offers invaluable insights to inform adaptive strategies and ensure the sustainability ..." is very weakly stated results compared to "...xxx percent performance improvement over conventional methods were achieved...". This abstract portends a lack of comparison to state-of-the-art benchmarks. No modeling was attempted to facilitate predictions using the presented data. The Introduction is decently done with some omitted very recent literature and some mild abuse of multi-citation without elaboration (XX double-citations and YY triple citations). 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competing alternatives were neither qualitatively described in the literature review nor quantitatively described in the manuscript, indicating a potential ignorance of the broader field that should be ameliorated in the revision by further developing the methods in the broad field before too quickly narrowing to the proposed lineage. adaption methods (e.g. [Mendelsohn, Dinar 1999]) seems to be the most recent technique compared, and the manuscript seems to be written only for readers already committed to using that technique as opposed to any more modern alternative. The most egregious omission is deterministic artificial intelligence, where the nonlinear, time-varying self-awareness statement facilitates (2-norm) optimal learning. Equations are omitted, degrading the manuscript quality. Figures are decently done with some mandatory improvements to ensure the readership has access to the content. Internal font size is sufficiently sized to insure legibility. Please consider the smallest advisable font size (to ensure legibility by the reader) to be the figure caption which provides a conveniently proximal prototype for sizing figures. Line styles and sizes are identical in figures 1–5 rendering the disparate data indistinguishable when the manuscript is read in archival printed hardcopy (particularly in black and white) negating the value of the figures due to reliance on colors. Tables are decently done to introduce problem formation (aiding repeatability), but quantitative results are neglected. 	
--	---	--

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>No.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Colonel Timothy Sands
Department, University & Country	Stanford University, California