

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_130527
Title of the Manuscript:	DROUGHT ASSESSMENT USING REMOTE SENSING AND GOOGLE EARTH ENGINE IN KALABURGI DISTRICT,NORTH-EASTERN DRY ZONE OF KARNATAKA
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is good in terms of addressing the study problem related to an important climate indicator that many locations on the Earth's surface suffer from due to its relationship to the economies of countries.	Thank you for recognizing the importance of this research. In response to your suggestion.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not good because it does not allow the opportunity with the study problem you want with a specific time period to process the manuscript, so please change the title to: Spatio-temporal decomposition of drought using remote sensing and Google Earth Engine in Kalaburgi District, North-Eastern Coastal Region of Karnataka	Thank you for pointing out this discrepancy. We agree that the title should be more specific to reflect the study area accurately. The study focuses exclusively on Kalaburgi district, in the North-Eastern Dry Zone of Karnataka covering five taluks (Kalaburgi, Jawargi, Sedam, Chitapur, and Afzalpur). To address this, we have revised the title to: "Drought Assessment in Kalaburgi District, North-Eastern Dry Zone of Karnataka, India, Using Remote Sensing and Google Earth Engine." This revised title ensures clarity and avoids confusion about the scope of the study. The updated title has been highlighted in the revised manuscript.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is good, but we hope to indicate the prevailing climatic conditions in the study area.	Thank you for the feedback.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is good in terms of its scientific approach to the subject.	Thank you for appreciating the scientific approach of this study. No further modifications were required regarding the methodology or approach, as the study adheres to established scientific principles and frameworks. Your positive feedback is greatly valued.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The researcher did not rely on similar studies that addressed the subject of the study, so he suggested that he add some research that is similar to his subject that addressed drought in arid and semi-arid regions, such as: Analysis and modeling of drought effects based on drought indicators in the eastern region of Missan	I have added relevant references, including the study "Analysis and modeling of drought effects based on drought indicators in the eastern region of Missan," to contextualize this research within similar studies.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	Thank you for the positive feedback on the language quality. Minimal corrections were made to enhance clarity and readability further.
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	Acknowledged. No ethical concerns have been identified in this manuscript.