

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_116546
Title of the Manuscript:	Groundwater Marketing Dynamics in Northern Dry Zone of Karnataka: A Comparative Study over Time
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"> 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>	<p>Topic: Groundwater Marketing Dynamics in Northern Dry Zone of Karnataka: A Comparative Study over Time. The timeframe of the study must reflect in the topic, i.e. the phrase "over time" should be replaced with "Groundwater Marketing Dynamics in Northern Dry Zone of Karnataka: A Comparative Study from.....year toyear."</p> <p>Abstract: The significance of study is not stated. This should be included.</p> <p>Introduction: There is no linkage between statements 1 and 2. The thought flows are totally different and as such, the two sentences must link for flow of thought.</p> <p>Research Gap / Statement of Research Problem: This is missing from the study, and should be included because it is the research gap necessitating the study</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>The research design is missing; this could be summarised in two sentences.</p> <p>The theoretical framework underpinning the study is not stated.</p> <p>The description of the study area is missing. This should include the geographical location (in terms of longitude and latitude), socio-economic characteristics of the inhabitants of the study area, the estimated population of the study area, rainfall patterns/drainage, as it affects groundwater dynamics, water bodies in the study area, and a political map depicting the study area. These are required to enhance the quality of the study.</p> <p>Recommendations: There are no recommendations for future studies and stakeholders in the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The quality of language is adequate</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The conclusion of the study effectively highlights several key findings regarding the shifting trends in the groundwater market in Karnataka. However, there are areas where the conclusion could be further strengthened and refined:</p> <p>The conclusion lacks specificity in certain areas. For example, it mentions "minimal acknowledgement of individual over-extraction," but providing more concrete data or evidence to support this claim would be beneficial. Adding specific statistics or case studies could enhance the credibility of the conclusion.</p> <p>Need for Actionable Recommendations: While the conclusion touches upon policy implications, it</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>could benefit from more specific and actionable recommendations. For instance, instead of simply suggesting a "shift towards incentivising water sharing," the conclusion could outline specific policy measures or initiatives that could be implemented to achieve this goal. Providing concrete steps for policymakers to follow would enhance the practicality and relevance of the recommendations.</p> <p>Limited Discussion of Potential Challenges: The conclusion primarily focuses on the positive aspects of the findings, such as increased market participation and potential economic gains from perennial crops. However, it does not adequately address potential challenges or obstacles arising from these trends. Discussing potential drawbacks or unintended consequences of market participation, such as exacerbating inequalities or environmental degradation, would provide a more balanced perspective.</p> <p>Integration of Future Research Directions: The conclusion could also benefit from discussing potential avenues for future research. Identifying gaps in the existing literature or areas for further investigation would help guide future research efforts and contribute to ongoing discussions on groundwater resource management in Karnataka. While the conclusion effectively summarizes the study's key findings, there are opportunities to enhance its specificity, provide more actionable recommendations, address potential challenges, and integrate future research directions. By addressing these areas, the conclusion could provide a more comprehensive and insightful overview of the implications of the study's findings for groundwater resource management in Karnataka.</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:	Tolulope A Olatoye
Department, University & Country	University of Fort Hare, South Africa