

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_122359
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatial and Temporal Analysis of Precipitation in Kathmandu Valley
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is a good work carried out by the author. It will be quite fruitful for all the scientists working on climate change especially on precipitation analysis. The data can be based for forecasting over the study areas.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Precipitation in Kathmandu Valley: A Spatio Temporal study	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes absolutely fine.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, the manuscript is a good. But it could have been better if the author would have done analysis upto 2022/2023. Methodologically it is quite robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References should be more at least 30 references must be there.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, it is good.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	In abstract authors should mention the number of stations undertaken for study rather than a generalised statement "majority of the stations"	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Satyabrata Mohanty
Department, University & Country	Visva-Bharati University, India