

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Geological Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_101485
Title of the Manuscript:	An Overview of Land Proxies of Paleomonsoon
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://journalajoger.com/index.php/AJGER/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is essential for scientific community since monsoon circulation has quite shown that it can lead to the change of climate.</p> <p><b>Definitely it is suitable .</b></p> <p><b>The abstract summarises the research well and should be short the way it is. Only the conclusion needs to come out well.</b></p> <p><b>I saw that they were well labelled and structured only that they need to be well put together and not the heading on one page and the body coming on to the next page.e.g methodology.</b></p> <p><b>Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p><b>Yes the references are recent apart from a few 1999 and 2001 ones but generally they are okay.Hence just a few references needs to be updated.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The work is not plagiarised which I find very commendable. Good work. Definitely Yes the quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I want to ask whether this work done due to offer of GRANTS, or scholarship?. If so the source of Funding should also be included and labelled it under Funding and the Grant Number provided, but if not. Then it can just remain the way it is.</p> <p>Try and include the name of the people who assisted you in the research too and their institutions and their email addresses too at the top page.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bernard Collins Anditi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Pecs, Hungary</b>