

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_116460
Title of the Manuscript:	Bias Correction of Monthly Precipitation from different General Circulation Models using Cumulative Density Function in Raipur District
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>After revision, the answer could become "yes".</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Comprehensive, but needs revision to insure the readership can understand the abstract.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. This is a major deficiency that must be revised before publication.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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 very few and not very current (very few 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. • Use of acronyms/abbreviations in an abstract is unlikely to attract readers not already aware of the manuscript's content. • 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. "...results showed substantial variability ... discrepancies underscored the complexities ... continued research efforts were crucial for improving the accuracy and reliability..." 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. The Introduction is decently done with very, very few references, some omitted very recent literature and some mild abuse of multi-citation without elaboration (3 double-citations but no triple 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	<p>citations).</p> <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. Stochastic approaches seem to be the most recent technique compared, and the manuscript seems to be written only for readers already committed to using CDFs 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 which has proven recently by many authors to be worthwhile for estimation, prediction, and control across many disparate disciplines.• [Raigoza,2022] in another award-winning work augmented [Sandberg, 2022]’s comparison with distributed waypoint guidance for autonomous collision avoidance.• [Osler, 2022] illustrated the deterministic artificial intelligence technique even applied to remotely operated vehicles.• [Wilt, 2022] demonstrated deterministic artificial intelligence permitted uncertainty control of microsattelites.• [Wang, 2023] in a highly cited and viewed article demonstrated deterministic artificial intelligence enabled UUV actuator control.• [Shah, 2021] proposed deterministic AI compared to several state-of-the-art methods to ascertain the best method to model, estimate, and control direct current motors. The top-cited sequel evaluated the efficacy of disparate parameter estimation methods such as recursive least squares, extended least squares, and batch least squares. In this sequel, deterministic artificial intelligence outperformed the model-following approach• The sequel urged future research into the limits of permissible discretization using deterministic artificial intelligence. [Koo, 2022] published exactly that specific research concluding discrete D.A.I. should be avoided when small step-size discretization is unavailable. In fact, continuous D.A.I. surpassed all modeling approaches.• Results just published by [Wang, 2023] discretized the predictive motor model at multiple step sizes inversely proportional to the computation rate and validated Koo’s results that performance improves with a decreasing step size, but furthermore discovered error mean was close to the application of continuous deterministic artificial intelligence when the step size is reduced further.• Following this investigation, [Menezes, 2023] investigated six disparate model discretization methods to discover the first-order hold method of discretization with a surprisingly large sample time of seven-tenths of a second yields greater than sixty percent improvement over the results presented in the prequel literature.• [Zhai, 2022] published a comparison of deep learning and deterministic algorithms for estimation and control modeling.• “The ongoing emission of greenhouse gases (GHGs) has led to a global increase in temperatures, resulting in climate change.” Is offered in the very first sentence without substantiating citation necessitating the readership already believe this strong claim. Equations are very few, but scientifically sound and well presented, enhancing the manuscript quality. Figures are decently done with some mandatory improvements to ensure the readership has access to the content.• Internal font size is occasionally too small (e.g., Figure 4). 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 4–7 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. <p>Tables are decently done to introduce problem formation (aiding repeatability) by listing the general circulation models, but not for the specific investigation performed. Tabularized quantitative results are neglected completely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Particularly for comparative figures (e.g., 4–7), please add a table of accompanying canonical figures of merit (e.g., means and deviations of difference, or others) to help the reader ascertain quantitative differences between the plotted data.• For such a manuscript, heavy in acronym and variable usage, please add periodic tables of	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>proximal definitions, so the readership is not required to flip back and forth between pages to remind themselves of acronym and variable definitions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inclusion of a table defining variables and acronyms in an appendix is welcome and effective. Please add such. <p>Reviewer's comments to the Editorial staff follow, in the greatest spirit of transparency: Decent research in manuscript that needs amelioration of (typical) writing deficiencies in a revision. Lots of manuscript revision is necessary, but solid research is present that will likely receive a recommendation to publish following satisfactory revision. The most concerning issue is seeming ignorance of the latest developments in the field.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Timothy Sands
Department, University & Country	Cornell University, USA