

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_115755
Title of the Manuscript:	Trend and Change Point Analysis of Temperature patterns in Telangana State using different Statistical Approaches.
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)
Compulsory 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, add new information to the field 2. Statistical Assessment of Temperature Trends and Change Points in Telangana State 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. About 53% is the within last 5 years. Not sure about the journal requirement regarding the references.	1. yes new information to the field is added to the conclusion part and highlighted the matter 2. Title change as suggested is made accordingly
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, just minor mistake. The language used is good and explanation is clear.	Grammatical mistakes suggested are changed accordingly as marked in the manuscript.
Optional/General comments	This paper is good for basic understanding of the data using basic and simple statistical analyses. However, the author did not give proper attention to detail such as inconsistency in the mathematical notation used and paper format. To be a good scholar attention to detail is important and should be instilled during PhD period.	

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)	