Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_111184**
Title of the Manuscript:	**GEOSPATIAL INTERPOLATIVE ANALYTICS OF GAUGED RAINFALL IN NETWORK UNDER SEMI-ARID SITUATION OF KRISHNA BASIN ON A WATERSHED SCALE**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. Yes, The manuscript investigates the spatial and temporal variability of rainfall in a specific watershed, employing advanced statistical methods like kriging. This research is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into rainfall patterns, contributing to hydrology, climatology, and environmental science. The findings can influence water resource management and environmental planning in similar regions. Overall, the manuscript is significant for its contribution to our understanding of rainfall dynamics.** **2. The title "GEOSPATIAL INTERPOLATIVE ANALYTICS OF GAUGED RAINFALL IN NETWORK UNDER SEMI-ARID SITUATION OF KRISHNA BASIN ON A WATERSHED SCALE" is suitable for the content of the manuscript. No alternative title is suggested.** **3. Yes** **4. The manuscript is well-organized with clear subsections, and the structure appears appropriate for conveying the research findings effectively.** **5. Based on the information provided and the methods outlined, the manuscript appears scientifically correct.** **6. The references provided in the manuscript appear sufficient and encompass a range of relevant studies. They are also relatively recent, contributing to the credibility of the research. However, it's recommended to ensure that any new and significant studies in the field, especially those published after the current manuscript's cutoff date, are considered for inclusion.** **Additional Suggestions/Comments:** **a. In the "Materials and Method" section, elaborate on the rationale for choosing the kriging method, especially the circular model, for spatial interpolation. This can provide additional context for readers.** **b. Ensure consistency in terminology throughout the manuscript. For example, the term "radial distance" is used, and it would be helpful to maintain this term consistently or clarify if there are specific instances where a different term is intended.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, a few minor revisions are recommended for clarity: a. In the "Introduction" section, consider rephrasing the following sentence for better clarity: Original: "Rainfall seing phenomenon characterized by continuous variability both in space and time..." Revised: "Rainfall is a phenomenon characterized by continuous variability in both space and time..."	

	b. In the "Materials and Method" section, revise the following sentence for clarity: Original: "The heirarchial the stream network system and its properties to were studied..." Revised: "The hierarchical stream network system and its properties were studied..."	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-structured, utilizing kriging and geostatistical methods for a comprehensive analysis of rainfall in the Krishna basin's semi-arid Huti-2 watershed. Tables 1-3 provide valuable insights, and the discussion aligns with contemporary research on flash floods. Consider brief explanations for key parameters in tables to enhance reader comprehension. The conclusion effectively summarizes findings, but a brief recap before concluding could enhance clarity. Overall, the manuscript is a valuable contribution.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**T. Aditya Sai Srinivas**
Department, University & Country	**Jayaprakash Narayan College of Engineering, India**