

### Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111217
Title of the Manuscript:	Stochastic Time Series Analysis, Modeling, and Forecasting of Weekly Rainfall Using SARIMA Model
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  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.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Applying autoregressive models such as ARIMA to forecast rainfall is a new research area. People will be interested in how to apply this technique in this research area. Thus, this manuscript is important for the scientific community.  2. Yes.  3. Yes.  4. Yes.  5. Yes.  6. Yes.	Thank you to the reviewer for the positive comment on our manuscript.  Ok  Ok  OK  OK  OK
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	Agreed
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. In 2.1 Study location, it will be better to add the map of India to show the position of Junagadh. 2. In line 178, perhaps there is a typo (The table 2 provides...). 3. In table 2, there is no number about MAPE. Please have a check. 4. In 3.3 Comparison of Actual and Predicted weekly rainfall value, there are just some brief descriptions about the comparison. Please add some statistical results to show the performance of the model.	1. Considering your point and the well-known nature of Junagadh, we have opted to maintain the manuscript's conciseness by not adding a map. We believe that given Junagadh's familiarity, the inclusion of a map might be unnecessary for our readers.  2. Corrected 3. Corrected 4. Already described

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	