

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript provides valuable insights into the impact of drought in Purulia District, West Bengal, India, making it important for the scientific community. By assessing various dimensions of drought and proposing practical solutions for agriculture practices, this study contributes to the understanding and mitigation of drought effects, particularly in vulnerable regions like Purulia.</p> <p>2. The title "Carving Drought Impact Over Purulia District, West Bengal, India" effectively captures the focus of the manuscript on analyzing drought impacts in Purulia District. It succinctly conveys the geographical scope and thematic emphasis of the study, making it suitable for the article.</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the manuscript, including the geographical context, types of drought impacts assessed, methodologies used, and proposed solutions. However, minor revisions could enhance clarity and conciseness to improve reader understanding.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate, facilitating a logical flow of information from introduction to methods, results, and discussion. However, some sections may benefit from further organization and clarity to improve readability and coherence.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, aligning with established practices and methodologies for assessing drought impacts. However, a thorough peer review process is necessary to validate findings and ensure accuracy.</p> <p>6. The references provided seem sufficient and relevant, supporting the study's context, methods, and findings. However, reviewers may consider suggesting additional recent references to enhance the comprehensiveness of the literature review and strengthen the study's foundation.</p> <p>7.</p>	<p>Thanks to the reviewer</p> <p>Thanks to the reviewer. To bring clarity some minor changes are done in the article sent</p> <p>Thanks to the reviewer. For clarity some sentences are organised</p> <p>Thanks to the reviewer. Recent references as far as possible is given</p> <p>To improve readability some restructuring of sentences is done</p> <p>Some terms are complex, and technical terms refer to recent advances in meteorology. However, the manuscript is for the elite masses.</p> <p>Some minor revisions are added to enhance the clarity, Grammarly and quality of the article.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are some areas where minor revisions could enhance clarity and readability. These revisions may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarifying complex or technical terms to ensure they are understandable to a wide audience.• Checking for grammatical errors, punctuation, and consistency in sentence structure.• Ensuring smooth transitions between sentences and paragraphs for improved coherence.• Reviewing sentence length and complexity to maintain reader engagement. <p>Overall, with some minor revisions to enhance language clarity and quality, the article would be well-suited for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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>	