

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_122332</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Rainfall Pattern Analysis and Change Point Detection: Kodagu District, Karnataka</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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)
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript " <b>Rainfall Pattern Analysis and Change Point Detection: Kodagu District, Karnataka</b> " is crucial for understanding regional climate variability, identifying significant trends, and detecting shifts in rainfall patterns, which are essential for informed water resource management, agricultural planning, and climate resilience strategies in the region.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title does not capture well the contents. The author is advised to change it to reflect the objective and results. I would suggest "Analysis of Rainfall Trends and Change Point Detection in Kodagu District, Karnataka"	
<b>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.</b>	<p>The paper examines the Rainfall Pattern and Change Point Detection. I suggest that the author rephrase the first sentence of the abstract to make it more indicative.</p> <p>I suggest to change the sentence to "This study aims to analyze the long-term trends and Change Point Detection in monthly, seasonal, and annual rainfall in Kodagu district, Karnataka, from 1950 to 2023"</p> <p>The abstract does not adhere to the standard structure, which should include the introduction, objective, data, methodology, results, and implications. I recommend that the author revises the abstract to follow this standard format.</p>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes</b> But the manuscript requires additional supportive statements in the literature review. The authors have not adequately situated the manuscript within the existing body of research. Providing a clearer context by integrating relevant literature will strengthen the foundation of the study and demonstrate its relevance and contribution to the field.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript "Rainfall Pattern Analysis and Change Point Detection: Kodagu District, Karnataka" demonstrates a solid foundation in scientific and technical methodology, employing established statistical techniques to analyse rainfall patterns and detect change points. However, it requires some improvement to fully achieve its potential. Enhancing the literature review with more supportive statements and better contextualizing the study within existing research will strengthen its scientific rigor. Additionally, clarifying the rationale for the chosen methods and improving the presentation of results will further bolster the manuscript's robustness and technical soundness.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =	<p>The references are not arranged correctly, as the author begins with [9] and a similar mix is observed in subsequent citations. I recommend following the appropriate reference style and adjusting all references accordingly.</p> <p>Reference List: All references should be consistently formatted. Please revise the reference list to ensure uniformity.</p>	

**Comment [A1]:** Consider revising the topic to align it with include all results

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The author is recommended to improve the language and clarity.	
Optional/General comments	The figure should clearly convey the information it represents. The author has not described the methodology used to generate the results shown in Table 1. These methods should be detailed in the methodology section.  For trend analysis, the author employed both linear regression and the modified Mann-Kendall method. The author should provide a rationale for using both methods.	

### 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:	<b>Ndakize Joseph Sebaziga</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Science, College of Science and Technology, University of Rwanda, Rwanda</b>