

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104399
Title of the Manuscript:	Insights into rainfall extremities across the agroclimatic zones of Tamil Nadu, India
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important because it shows the extremes of rainfall which is an important meteorological parameter for crops, livestock, drinking water sources and overall food security.</p> <p>The title reflects the objectives of the research. So I think the title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>The abstract is very limited, it is not structured.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are adequate (only the discussion of results is missing)</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically written properly. All that remains is to discuss the results.</p> <p>The number and date of publication of the references are adequate and sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English used in the article is suitable for communication between academic and scientific peers.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is necessary to make a discussion and confrontation of its results with those of other authors.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hermes Ulises Ramirez Sanchez
Department, University & Country	Instituto De Astronomia Y Meteorologia, Universidad De Guadalajara, Mexico