Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_95842**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Study on long term trend analysis on occurrence of dew at Raipur**
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:

(https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.7

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community. Yes, the title of the article suitable. The abstract of the article lacks statistical quantitative result, which ought to justify the qualitative results. subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate, the methodology lacks appropriate statistical analysis. The references are insufficient, however, they are recent.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments	Study on long term trend analysis on occurrence of dew at Raipur was investigated in the article. The variations in total average dew day and total dew amount for period of 1991 – 2020 were observed with emphasis on critical months October, November and December marked with decrease in total amount of dew as a result of climate change. The study is relevant to scientific community. However, the statistical terms (significance and insignificance) used in the study was merely applied in the inferential sense. The authors ought to use the total amount of dew for October, November and December to carry out test of hypothesis via t-test or z-test, f-test, chi-test with a stipulated confidence interval to be able to know if null hypothesis is accepted or rejected or the alternate hypothesis is rejected or accepted before drawing inferential conclusions made in the article. Considering that the adjusted value of coefficient of determination, R2 is very low in Figures 1, 2 and 3. I suggest that you can search for improved R2 by plotting total amount of dew against total average dew day for October, November and December as a composite plot. This will give visual understanding on how total dew amount varied for the three months. The statistical analysis of the composite plot, test of hypothesis will unveil if decrease in amount of dew point is significant or insignificant for the three months. Attributing the decrease of total amount of dew to climate change is a mere assumption as there is no connection between climate change factor (CO_2 concentration or atmospheric temperature) and total amount of dew. Thus, the conclusion that decrease in total amount of dew is not buttressed by research finding. However, if there is similar investigation, you can cite the literature to use it to back up your conclusion. The conclusion must be supported by your result, which ought be part of specific objective. Moreover, the axis title and units of the Figures 1, 2 and 3 are missing and should be included in the revision.	

Review Form 1.7

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Stephen Ndubuisi Nnamchi**
Department, University & Country	**Kampala International University, Uganda**