



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p><b>1- Overall, I think the authors don't respond well to the reviewer's comments.</b></p> <p><b>2- In the title, Is this a period? or two different years? this has to be clear</b></p> <p><b>3- Abstract is too long, it has to be shortened.</b></p> <p><b>4- There is no study area paragraph, the author goes directly from introduction to methodology.</b></p> <p><b>5- In Methodology, there is information on the study area, geographical location, annual rainfall, description of study area, This is incorrect, Therefore, A new separated section (paragraph) has to be created talking about description of the study area.</b></p> <p><b>6- According to equations, they should be re-formulated in a standard way, so that they can be understood easily.</b></p> <p><b>Also, adding the necessary citation of these equations.</b></p> <p><b>7- The author has to write a separate section on the theoretical background for these equations with detailed explanations.</b></p> <p><b>8- In Page 7, there are three small maps, without explanation, caption, without scale, coordinates, without even indication within text.</b></p> <p><b>They are absolutely unacceptable in this form.</b></p> <p><b>9- Very few references were used in this study.</b></p> <p><b>10- References were not written, formatted based on a standard method of documentation, or based on the Journal instructions.</b></p>	<p>-Dear Sir/Madam, I regret that I have failed to understand and respond to the reviewers comments as per your expectation. But I have tried my level best to improve it this time and hope it meets your requirements. I apologize for the inconvenience and request you to help me in improving the manuscript to make it good fit for your esteemed journal.</p> <p>-The article aims to compare two studies (carried by Nayak (2007) and Yamuna (2021)) regarding same research problem, in same study area, with similar approach but in two different times (2007 and 2021). So in title I intended to represent two different years. Since it was not appropriate this time I have changed it to '2007 to 2021' to represent change in dynamics of research problem from 2007 to 2021.</p> <p>-The abstract was of 300 words but it has been reduced to 250 words</p> <p>-The details of study area was included in methodology but now it is made into separate section before methodology.</p> <p>-The equations used in study was taken from previous study that is Nayak (2007), PhD thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences Dharwad which is mentioned before the equation. To make the model easy to understand only final logit regression equation is retained which is of the form <math>y = ax_1 + bx_2 + cx_3 \dots\dots</math></p> <p>-The detailed explanation of the theoretical framework of the model used in research paper is included in the methodology under heading '3.1 Logit regression model'</p> <p>-The three small maps added earlier were district level maps of study area which was not familiar to the reader. So the comprehensive maps with captions, indications and relative position in state and nation is added in the revised manuscript. To keep the format of map intact a separate pdf file of map will be attached in the mail, because there is a chance that elements in map could move out of their place in document file and may not represent intended explanation.</p> <p>Added references in the explanation.</p> <p>Formatted based on journal instruction</p>