

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_122681
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate Information Services (CIS): A Vital Tool for Africa's Climate Resilience
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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.	This article has not revealed CIS and CIS's importance if it is a useful tool yet. Moreover, there is not nearly research results that article is only review some materials and conclusion. It is not a research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, CIS is only a tool for agriculture, human, environment, sociality, economy, etc. However, it cannot be a tool for climate resilience because climate can be regenerated by impacting of human. CIS is information in climate service. Therefore, it is only useful with agriculture development, economy, and environment health. This article needs to be changed title or to be demonstrated that it is really a tool.	
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.	Abstract has not revealed research results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	
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.	This article has not value of research science	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This article has not been identified yet research aims leading methodology is not clearly 2. All the results are cited by other authors at all and they are only reference information 3. Conclusion is not suitable with title 4. Title and article content mention to Africa, how many countries in Africa? It has not presented in the article. 5. Research methodology needs to display core steps of problem, which the article want to research. 6. Where sources with Figure 1 and 2? 	

Review Form 3

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:	Minh Thu Nguyen
Department, University & Country	Vietnam Institute of Meteorology Hydrology and Climate change, Vietnam