

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJECC_117975
Title of the Manuscript:	Indigenous Traditional Knowledge Collection in NICRA-AICRPAM domain districts for weather events
Type of the 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the information or data on traditional knowledge on weather forecasting has significant contribution in crop production towards development of agricultural knowledge. Natural information should be used as a base and reference as technical input in any development activities. Hence, research and documenting is worthy.</p> <p>Yes, but redundant word may be removed, suggested in edited article</p> <p>Yes, but lack the flow and coherence of expression. It need rearrangement and editing</p> <p>No, the manuscript need to include subsection to improve the writing.</p> <p>Yes, but need correction in language and editing</p> <p>Yes, but not well discussed</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No. The language of writing need detailed revision. The values in the findings were not presented in detail.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article information is found important. But the language used to express the content should be revised in all sections. Repeated in similar expressions noted in abstract section. The materials methods section not expressed details of the study and approach, and variables. The sample size in interview and questionnaire not known.</p> <p>The result section need to revise the expressions. The findings not well reported. The lists of farmers name in the table should be replaced by sample size or other expressions. The authors has no right to present farmers or interviewed persons in publications. The findings need to be presented in subsections.</p> <p>The conclusion does not address the finding.</p> <p>Many references/ yellow shaded are not cited in the text. The section missed uniform style of referencing. It violate the rule of referencing.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zenebe Mekonnen Adare
Department, University & Country	Arba Minch University, Ethiopia