

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_85432
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Spatial and Temporal Drought Severity; A Study in Transition zone in Karnataka State in India
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> )

### 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	<b>ABSTRACT:</b> The abstract is incomplete. Generally, it needs to start with the justification for the research, with the gap/problem being addressed highlighted, and then the objectives of the research. The methodology and the findings come next. The given abstract doesn't tell the reader why the work has been done, and its importance. <b>INTRODUCTION:</b> Inadequate. Needs to review more similar work, and identify the gap that this research will fill very clearly. At present, the Introduction section doesn't read like a journal paper. FIGURE 1: not mentioned in the text anywhere. <b>METHODOLOGY:</b> The validation of the work is not discussed clearly – how ad what data. Please add this component. <b>CONCLUSION:</b> Remind the reader what your objective(s) was(were), and summarize your key findings, before you go to the policy implication. <b>LANGUAGE:</b> Grammar, sentence structure, punctuations, and spelling need to be corrected. Typos need to be fixed as well.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	I have also left comments in the manuscript itself, where relevant, since there are no line numbers to refer to. So please take that into consideration as well, since only the summary is given in this table.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Ranmalee Bandara
Department, University & Country	Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka