

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_86651
Title of the Manuscript:	An Evaluation of the Performance of five Meteorological Drought Monitoring Indices over an Arid and Semi-Arid Region of Gujarat (India).
Type of the 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 1.6

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	Overall, the manuscript looks good. However, there are a couple of major issues that need to resolve – 1. Please address why these five indices have been chosen for this study? 2. Summary results of the five indices need to provide, and the study's implication should be described in the discussion section.	Done
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction</p> <p>1. A list of various published indices has been provided, but some of the indices are missing details names, for example, RDDI, SRI, etc. Please complete the list.</p> <p>2. Why these five indices chosen from the extensive list of indices, a discussion in the introduction would be helpful for better objective settings.</p> <p>3. Results showed that drought indices for seven locations/districts should be added to the study's objective.</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>1. Level 3 heading at the beginning of the study area should be level 2, for example, 2.1 (not 2.1.1).</p> <p>2. You can prepare a table or provide a description of the average rainfall for seven selected districts (you provided a couple of districts) over the state and India would be helpful, as you used them in your analysis and described in the result section.</p> <p>3. You mention drought every 3 to 4 years in one line, and the following line is written almost every year; please resolve the conflict or rewrite to clarify what you mean by this with proper citations.</p> <p>4. Equation of the indices needs to complete. For example, equation 3 is incomplete, or equation 1 has spaces.</p> <p>Result and discussion</p> <p>1. Drought Severity Classification should be moved to the method section. This table is not your result.</p> <p>2. Summary results of the 167 stations for five methods should be provided first before discussing their correlation.</p> <p>3. What are the reasons for the selection of the seven districts should be discussed; it will help understand the results of these stations/cities.</p> <p>4. Discussing your findings with other studies would help the reader to understand how your results are useful.</p> <p>5. Discussion about the implications of this study would be more insightful for the paper.</p> <p>Figures</p> <p>1. Figures look good. Please fix the y-axis title for figure 2.</p> <p>Reference</p> <p>Please update your reference list with number as you cited in the manuscript.</p>	Comment accepted and considered
Optional/General comments		

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)	