

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_127324
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatial Assessment of Erosivity and Arid Conditions in Somalia Using the CORINE Model
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript offers a comprehensive analysis of erosivity and arid conditions in Somalia, employing the CORINE model, which is crucial for understanding and managing soil erosion and drought in a vulnerable region. The study's findings have practical applications for land management, water resource conservation, and policymaking. However, to increase its impact, the manuscript needs clearer explanations of how the results can inform policy decisions and land-use practices in Somalia.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the content of the paper, but it could be slightly refined for clarity. Consider: <i>"Geospatial Assessment of Erosivity and Arid Conditions in Somalia Using the CORINE Model."</i>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides an adequate summary but lacks clarity in parts. It would benefit from specifying the practical implications of the findings. Also, the abstract could highlight the significance of using the CORINE model in arid regions outside Europe.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are logically organized and appropriate. However, the "Results" section would benefit from a clearer presentation of key findings, supported by well-structured maps and graphs. Enhancing the flow and connectivity between sections would improve readability.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, with a sound methodology and relevant use of the CORINE model. The combination of MFI and BGI indices is appropriate for the study's aims. However, more details on the data quality and potential sources of error would strengthen the manuscript. In addition, discussing the limitations of using CORINE in non-European contexts would be beneficial.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are adequate but could be improved by including more recent studies on soil erosion and aridity in arid and semi-arid regions, especially those using similar methodologies.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript requires minor grammatical corrections and language refinement to enhance readability. Phrases like "law" should be corrected to "low," and some sentences need restructuring for clarity. The figures and tables are useful but should be clearer. Adding more detailed legends and explanations would improve comprehension. Ensure that all figures are of high quality and are easy to interpret.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript provides valuable insights, but it would be beneficial to discuss how the findings compare with similar studies conducted in East Africa or other arid regions. Additionally, consider adding a brief section on future research directions or recommendations for soil conservation strategies.	

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:	Munir Hayet Khan
Department, University & Country	INTI International University, Malaysia