

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJARR_118040
Title of the Manuscript:	INTER-CONNECTION BETWEEN REFRACTIVITY GRADIENT VARIATIONS AND INTERTROPICAL DISCONTINUITY OVER NIGERIA
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. The study's findings and recommendations can be crucial for policymakers and researchers in the fields of climate change, agriculture, and sustainable development. The manuscript's detailed analysis of the effects of climate change on agricultural productivity and its potential solutions contribute significantly to the scientific community's understanding of this pressing issue. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. The manuscript titled "The Impact of Climate Change on Agricultural Productivity in the Sahel Region," I examined the references provided in the manuscript. The references appear to be relevant and sufficient for the study's objectives, as they include a mix of academic articles, reports, and datasets from reputable sources. The references are generally recent, with the majority published within the last decade. This suggests that the authors have taken a contemporary approach to the topic and have considered the latest research findings. However, to further strengthen the manuscript's credibility and relevance, additional references can be added.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, I believe the language and English quality are suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	No Comment	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maniriho Claudien
Department, University & Country	Rwanda Polytechnic- IPRC Tumba, Rwanda