

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_115643
Title of the Manuscript:	Carving Drought Impact Over Purulia District, West Bengal, India
Type of the Article	

### 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. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	  1. Yes, because the paper covered drought impacts such as Meteorological, Hydrological and agricultural assessments by considering the meteorological parameters, also their vulnerability and risk levels. The fundamental factors impacting susceptibility and risk, are recognized, and the drought years are analyzed.  2. Carving Drought Impact Over Purulia District, West Bengal, India, Yes but I also suggested the following i. Winding the Drought impact, Bending the Drought impact, coiling the Drought impact, Mapping the Drought impact or Drought impact assessments.  3. Yes it comprehensive, but come up with some observations. i. It should be single line spacing ii. It should be bolded or italicized iii. Groundwater should be remove from the abstract keywords  4. Headings and subheadings should be given a number e.g introduction 1.0, subheading 1.1, 1.2 1.3 e.t.c 5. Yes it come up with the scientific context 6. The references are to be accepted because about 70% are recent. 7. The manuscript should be condense to 12 to highest 14 pages because that will attract the scholars attention for the paper to get more citations.	<b>Thanks to reviewer</b>  I think carving drought Impact would be more appropriate.  Single spacing is done  Removed  Complied
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	  It partially ok because there many denotations in the manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Refer to the above comment, I suggested for the Gramarily application should be used to avoid that errors	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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