

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102152
Title of the Manuscript:	Qualitative evaluation of the high resolution satellite precipitation products with dense surface rain gauge observations in Odisha over a time period
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> )

### 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 REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>According to the topic of the article in question, it is associated with some writing problems. But it can be a good article provided that the respected authors include many corrections in the article. That in the introduction section, the writing is very dumb and a little out of the topic of the article, which can be caused by the author's inaccuracy in the writing of the article.</p> <p>Correct writing should be used throughout the article. For example, when talking about the data used, all the data should be explained in one section. Which can be seen in the whole article. It shows that the intellectual order is not seen in the authors of the article.</p> <p>The results section is very weak and summarized on one page and only by giving a few paragraphs of statistical results and tables and graphs that about one third of the studied areas were below average. The authors, citing one page, concluded that this model is excellent in the region. Without examining other factors such as natural climatic factors and... The region, or examining this model for more years, or comparing it with other models, they have achieved these results with only one year. Definitely call this model the best in the abstract. That the method of scientific conclusion is not correct. It is hoped that serious corrections will be applied in this section and even in all sections of the article. The article should be the result of accurate and appropriate scientific work so that its results can be presented and evaluated. As a result, according to the things mentioned in the article and explanations, the article is very unreasonable and misleading in terms of scientific structure. It is hoped that the article will be fundamentally revised with the decision of the respected editor. and then be re-evaluated.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	The structure of the English text of the article is good.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ali Mohamadpour Zeidi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kharazmi University of Tehran, Iran</b>