

# Review of: "Spatio-Temporal Analysis of Precipitation Patterns in Xinjiang Using TRMM Data and Spatial Interpolation Methods: A Comparative Study"

Subaran Chandra Sarker<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Begum Rokeya University, Rangpur

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Reviewer comments

The study is full of limitations. Further, the authors should completely overhaul the manuscript. Since critical reworking and restructuring are needed, I suggest rejecting the manuscript.

### The specific comments are:

1. An abstract is not well organized. The abstract must be improved. The authors must explain the application and novelty of the research work in the abstract section.
2. Impoverished introduction section. I didn't see any strong motivation for this study. There is no contribution either. The authors need to overhaul the introduction section completely. The literature section must be improved with more advanced articles that explain why your present study is different and better to explain novelty. Also, research gaps are not apparent.
3. I am disappointed the authors did not cite any literature when they described the overview of the study area.
4. It is tough to understand the figures and graphs when the labels, text, scales, and legends are not in English.
5. The figure captions must be elaborate, explaining the details of what the figure says, even without the help of the manuscript text.
6. "The quality check of the datasets was checked." How and what was the method? Please make clear the missing data.
7. There are no justifications for the methods used. Please justify the methods used.
8. Why use so old data? Is recent data not available?
9. The authors haven't mentioned the significance level for the trend in the result section. Please discuss station-wise rainfall trend values.
10. Currently, there is no discussion. Write the discussion. Justify your result and compare it with previous literature. Describe the novelty, who will benefit from these results, and how.
11. Every study has some limitations; what is the limitation of this study? Mention it in the conclusion section. Also, discuss the merits and demerits of applied methods.
12. Review English grammar, as there are mistakes throughout the text. Some sentences are long. To improve readability,

consider breaking those into multiple sentences.

13. The manuscript has some spelling errors (ex. Section 3.3.1, 'haracteristics' should be characteristics).
14. The article cites only nine pieces of literature, which is insufficient for presenting your innovation, justifying, and comparing the results.