



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>Step 2 (page 3-4) has to be explained better L82 and 84: what are i and j? L92: x_{ij} is the same as X_{ij} before? L89: what is X_{ij}? For instance X_1 is "Variance of annual rainfall"?</p>	<p>* I have included relationship of vulnerability and indicators in table format for better understanding *i and j are the values ith number or ith value in jth column *yes here I made mistake and now I changed that with Y_{ij} since the normalised value should come in that position</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>This is an international journal. Please specify where are Karnataka and Rajasthan (India?). Rabi is spring harvest L 77 change to "to be normalized"</p>	<p>*I have changed the title of the paper and mentioned india in the bracket *Rabi is the season – I have mentioned that one *I used min-max formulae to normalise L77 indicators and I have included that one in methodology step-2</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript tries to somehow parametrize vulnerability of a region to climate change. It is very questionable if the methodology actually is meaningful, but that will have to be proven in reality. However, the authors should better explain the methodology. Especially Step 2. I do not see how anybody can understand what they are doing.</p>	<p>*The methodology I have used here is based on some past research and findings *I have mentioned detailed relationship between indicators and vulnerability for better understanding</p>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	