



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_49074
Title of the Manuscript:	Simulation of Meteorological Drought of Bankura District, West Bengal: Comparative Study between Exponential Smoothing and Machine Learning Procedures
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How to create the first coherent picture of multi-season rainfall deficit occurrence and persistence across the region and, in the process, subject to the studied. 2. The analysis should highlights the immense value of carefully cataloguing station metadata which is an essential resource for interpreting break-points and exceptional runs of below/above average precipitation. 3. The research work should determine whether these regimes form coherent clusters in space, is possible or not. 	<p>Agreed with the reviewer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research work has been done in 12 month time frame. 2. The analysis highlights the importance of station metadata in the first picture and for the convenience of the analysis all the station data has been accumulated. Also it is also possible to highlight station-wise prediction of rainfall and S_d. But for shortage of space it is not done. 3. These regimes can form coherent clusters in space through PCA or factor analysis.
Minor REVISION comments		
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)	