

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97643
Title of the Manuscript:	Advancements in Modelling Protocols for Assessing Climate Change Impacts on Water Resources: A Comprehensive Review
Type of the Article	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)
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)	<p>Yes, the topic is very important for scientific community. In particular, the manuscript deals with climate change</p> <p>Yes... but it is very long.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is well written.</p> <p>Yes, the structure of the article is well organized.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Some references are not recent. The authors can add other references, more recent, for example on the breaking of the Milankovitch cycles and stochastic resonance.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language needs to be revisited	
Optional/General comments	The article is well written. It is possible to add some figures in the text? The authors speak about simulation but not present any data or figures.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Teresa Caccamo
Department, University & Country	Messina University, Italy