

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_99299</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of long term spatial-temporal variability of wind speed</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The article submitted for review is clearly exploratory in nature. The data presented in it show the complexity of the studies performed, the results of which will positively influence the practical results of its implementation.</p> <p>The title of the article suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the article comprehensive</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references sufficient and recent</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In the final editing of the article, in my opinion, the "old" sources should be removed from the list of cited literature. published before 2000.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Yakov G. Verkhivker</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Odessa National University of Technology, Ukraine</b>