

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_117599
Title of the Manuscript:	Time Series Trend Analysis of Temperature and Rainfall Using Mann-Kendall Method: A Study of Vadodara City, Gujarat
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://journalajgr.com/index.php/AJGR/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> At this stage, no, it is not important for the scientific community. The author needs to be consistent with the formatting of text, figures, figure captions, and tables. The use of different font colors and sizes makes the paper look unprofessional. Figures should not include titles within themselves; figure captions are a more professional way to describe figures. All elements of an equation need to be introduced, and proper credit should be given to the original researcher who introduced the equation. However, no citations are provided for any equations. The title is interesting. An abstract in one paragraph stating the research question and the novelty of the work is necessary. The introduction consists of paragraphs of varying lengths that need to be revised for consistency. Moreover, the last paragraph of the introduction should state the objectives of the study and its novelty, which are currently missing. The introduction section includes several pieces of information that are not well connected. The author needs to rewrite this section to enhance the links between paragraphs and ensure a smooth flow of information. The materials and methods section needs to be divided into several subheadings, with large chunks of information split into these subheadings. Describing Figure 1, it is mentioned that the lowest minimum temperature is found in December, but from the figure, it appears to be January, not December. The author needs to carefully describe R² values, as most of them are very low. When describing figures, the author only mentions the trends of the graphs without providing an in-depth discussion, which needs to be included. The discussion section is not properly described; instead, it summarizes the results. This section should include theoretical concepts and an in-depth discussion of the findings. The author needs to substantially improve the quality of writing. Most of the references are very old, with the latest one from 2018. Since then, many articles have been published; the authors need to review these papers and include them. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No, the author needs to check grammar and spelling throughout. In some places, sentences are incomplete (e.g., "The pattern and amount of the rainfall [6]." and ".....negative trend at 95% found.....").</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>For Figure 5, the X-axis title is missing, and there is a spelling mistake in the legend.</p> <p>Pre-monsoon, monsoon, and post-monsoon periods need to be defined clearly for the readers. Any acronym must be defined upon first use, even common ones like SD for standard deviation. Moreover, the acronym should remain consistent throughout the text.</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:	Mosammat Mustari Khanaum
Department, University & Country	North Dakota State University, USA