



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_50662
Title of the Manuscript:	Mapping a climate change vulnerability index: An assessment in agricultural, geological and demographic sectors across the districts of Karnataka
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/sdi-general-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Nowadays, assessment of vulnerability index is becoming research hotspot. This manuscript is too simple, and a lot of content has not been clearly stated. It is recommended that the author make a substantial revision as a whole.</p> <p>Some detailed comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The most critical issue is that the title is " Mapping a climate change vulnerability index..." , however, the manuscript does not have even one map. Please change the title or modify the manuscript content. 2. In my opinion, a very critical issue here is that the authors do not have a sufficient literature review. The authors do not provide a proper problem description in the introduction, and do not cover any international experience to begin with. 3. Data are too complicated. I suggest the authors provide the data description in another way, for example, change the words into a table. A table is proposed to add in this section. 4. Please add the location map of the study area (including the distribution of 30 districts) in order to provide convenience for the reader's to understand the conclusions. 5. Please add the flow chart of the method. The current "2. Methodology" is too much like a research report. 6. "3. Results and Discussion:" It is recommended to add mathematical analysis instead of just give tables to list the results. 7. No "Discussion" part? please strengthen the writing of discussion part. 8. There are too few references, only 7 references? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Now I made small modification in the title and I have included the vulnerability map of the different districts • I have included some more literature review in the introduction part • I have added location map in Fig-1 • Offcourse methodology is too much , but methodology I have adopted is the core of this paper , for better understanding of results, it should be mandatory • If I add mathematical analysis the table will be too large. I think methodology will take care of understanding mathematical part of the analysis • Since I found only few studies on sectoral vulnerability assessment, I can able to discuss little on my results by comparing those research results • Now I have added sufficient references
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	