

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_IJECC_87820
Title of the Manuscript:	Occurrence of climatic drought over western zone of Tamil Nadu
Type of the Item	Original Research 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 1.6](#)

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 REVIEW comments</p>	<p>Topic.-The topic is interesting, however, I suggest changing Incidence instead of Occurrence... I leave it to the best judgment of the author/s.</p> <p>Resume.-This section constitutes an important element when assessing an academic paper, since it allows a global look at the research carried out; therefore, the following must be taken into account:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is written in the past tense 2. It must have an objective, hypothesis, present the methodology and the main conclusions. 3. In this case you must order and complement the suggested elements. <p>Keywords. -Use the Unesco Thesaurus that allows a better location of your article, since its language is universal.</p> <p>Water resources, agriculture, climatology...</p> <p>Introduction.-The research problem is well defined; On the other hand, the objective and justification is conducive to this study.</p> <p>Materials and methods. -In this section goes: Materials and methods, but not information and methodology that are elements that are part of this item.</p> <p>Materials. This section should answer the following question: how was it done? Detail must be given of each and every one of the steps that were followed to obtain the results, and of the materials used.</p> <p>Method. As the way of proceeding or the procedure followed in the sciences to find the truth and demonstrate it.</p> <p>Methodology. The methodology must be reproducible, hence the importance of the clarity with which it is exposed. If the method is known, it is only mentioned and the bibliographic citation is required. If it is new or if it is a known but modified method, it should be explained in detail.</p> <p>5 steps to take into account: Design, population, setting, interventions and statistical analysis.</p> <p>I SUGGEST YOU REVIEW THIS SECTION, IT IS INCOMPLETE.</p> <p>Results and Discussion.The results are propitious and the reading is of significant contribution.</p> <p>It is good to indicate in the discussion, if there are other studies on this topic to determine its originality.</p> <p>It is necessary to indicate the main results without these being repeated in the analysis.</p> <p>The difficulties encountered throughout the study should be expressed, if any.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>It would be good to indicate the possible lines of research that can be found from this work.</p> <p>Conclusion.The conclusion is clear against the method used, in addition, it is in relation to the stated objective.</p> <p>Analysis at different time scales to discover the impact of slow-onset drought on agricultural production. (if this is it?)</p> <p>References:The references appear to be weak to support an important study. This would only be justified when the study is original, where research sources almost do not exist, but it is not mentioned in the discussion, leaving an important gap.</p> <p>In many cases, the references are the ones that support the academic seriousness of the work, for this reason, at least 40-50 references are requested throughout the length of the paper. However, it depends on the Journal and its acceptance in terms of publication regulations.</p> <p>It would be important to make adjustments in this section, due to the importance of this study</p>	
Minor REVIEW comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Jverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador