

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_107145
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Climate Change and aquifer recharge in three localities in the South-west of Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The article is extremely good all round. The author has done a really good job in putting this piece together. Apart from its quantitative nature which has made it more scientific, the methods employed in data collection and analysis is pretty much modern and only adds to it being scientifically robust.</p> <p>2. I also think the author got his title absolutely spot on. Actually, seeing the title alone is appealing enough to catch your attention, and he worked to ensure that the subject matter does not disappoint either.</p> <p>3. His Abstract captures precise description of the study area, methods used, research justification as well as potential benefits for the academic community. This was good of the author.</p> <p>4. I think the article is well organized and structured with all the important pieces fitting in appropriately.</p> <p>5. The article is scientifically robust as already indicated above. The methods used in data collection and analysis has added to it being scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The author has used materials from both recent and past sources. This is an accepted practice in academia since knowledge does not really become outdated except for new discoveries that may come to discredit ancient theories.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Saving only some minor semantical issues inherent in this article, I think the author has generally excelled with his language and usage. The minor spelling mistakes and omissions should be rectified with a bit more of due diligence.</p> <p>2. Consequently, I am rating it suitable for the scholarly community</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Generally speaking, this article has the potential to be a really high quality or high impact publication.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David Baaman Laar
Department, University & Country	Kumbungu Senior High School, Ghana