



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>Some detailed comments:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>5. Please add the flow chart of the method. The current "2. Methodology" is too much like a research report.</li> <li>6. "3. Results and Discussion:" It is recommended to add mathematical analysis instead of just give tables to list the results.</li> <li>7. No "Discussion" part? please strengthen the writing of discussion part.</li> <li>8. There are too few references, only 7 references?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Now I made small modification in the title and I have included the vulnerability map of the different districts</li> <li>• I have included some more literature review in the introduction part</li> <li>• I have added location map in Fig-1</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• If I add mathematical analysis the table will be too large. I think methodology will take care of understanding mathematical part of the analysis</li> <li>• Since I found only few studies on sectoral vulnerability assessment, I can able to discuss little on my results by comparing those research results</li> <li>• Now I have added sufficient references</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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