



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_25349
Title of the Manuscript:	Rainfall Variability in Sine Saloum River basin in a context of climate change and variability
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Good paper include in depth analysis and sound review of literature.</p> <p>SPI, NPI and exploratory analysis have been carried out and results may be useful for drought mitigation</p>	<p>We thank the reviewers for the general comments regarding methodology, reference, results and quality of the paper.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>In abstract revise this sentence "In total, the 43 years of the study period, we were 13 wet years including and 30 dry years; 1971 was the wettest years and 2007 less rainy"</p> <p>Line 108 Replace "They are" to "These were"</p>	<p>Thank you for this remark and suggestion. It is a mistake; remarks and suggestions are taken into account in the final version of the paper.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		<p>We thank the editor in chief and all the journal staff for their concern for efficiency, transparency and quality. We also thank the reviewers for all the time they devoted to the reading and evaluation the paper. Their criticism, comment and suggestion have reinforced us.</p>