

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_117264 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A Comparison of the Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) and the Rainfall Anomaly Index (RAI) during the Meteorological Drought across Harohar-Punpun Basin (India). |
| Type of the 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>1. This paper has potential to make a valuable contribution to the scientific community but substantial revisions are needed to strengthen the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>2. The title of this manuscript is not suitable because the manuscript aims to assess the frequency and intensity of drought for the Harohar-Punpun Basin. So, I don't understand why it can be written as a comparison between two methods of this assessment.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive but the first sentence defining the drought can be withdrawn and starting with the context of the study.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate. Indeed, the structure is like IMRAD structure but there should have a section named Methodology in which there are study area, data collection and the methods of the analysis.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct because it addresses the crucial problem face in the Harohar-Punpun Basin and the method and tools used are scientific even though the relevance of the index is dependent on the variables included. In addition, the study area should be more developed and the section should be reviewed because you have to provide more information about the area and you should review the table of the description, especially the row of rainfall where you wrote 99 cm. it is 99cm or 99mm.</p> <p>6. The references are some recent papers but are not sufficient because I'm very sure, it can have more articles in line of your manuscript;</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>1. I think the language used is suitable for scholarly communications.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | No comments | |

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) |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Malam Maman Nafiou |
| Department, University & Country | Abdou Moumouni Uniniversity of Niamey, Niger |