

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_88670
Title of the Manuscript:	THE DYNAMICS OF RAIN PATTERN IN EAST KALIMANTAN
Type of the Article	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>)

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	Despite the subject being interesting and deserves analysis scientific, the paper has serious flaws that prohibit its acceptance. The manuscript in its current form is not ready for publication. Much quality assurance check in the introduction is needed to check the coherence and the order of the content. The use of topic sentences for each paper is quite helpful to improve the coherence of the article, and the paper does not have a correct order. It is also necessary for a significant English language grammar correction. The technical quality is low. There is no in-depth literature review about the paper subject related to previous studies. Also, there is no methodology. The paper has only two figures. Moreover, the authors did not discuss the subject/results. The conclusion, at least, should contain the following items: 1. Contribution to the body of knowledge, 2. Contribution of the study to the practice, 3. Limitation of the research, 4. Possible implications, 5. Further studies recommendations. The paper must be improved to reach the scientific merit as a journal paper requires. In this way, the paper is not can be accepted for publication.	
Minor REVISION 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Liseane Padilha Thives
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil