



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_48168
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate Predictions for Ludhiana District of Indian Punjab under RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page/sdi-general-editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the background given for the study is too basic and should be improved to illustrate the study problem and help the potential readers appreciate the usefulness of the study.</li> <li>- I feel the section about the study area being placed in the background is sincerely misplaced.</li> <li>- the methods used in the study are not presented at all. Why?</li> <li>- data quality control is not mentioned</li> <li>- the discussion of the results is just too poor. The author(s) do a "mere display of results". e.g. why does it seem that rainfall will decrease in MC and yet increase in EC?</li> <li>- to me, it seems that the author(s) had/have a cursory understanding of the RCPs</li> <li>- besides, it is not mentioned how the results compare with other results at least local/global studies over India</li> <li>- generally the author(s) read/consulted just a handful of study resources which is not surprising for the limited discussion presented.</li> </ul> <p><b>Before the paper is accepted, it should consider all the above comments and undergo a major upgrade</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Isaac Mugume</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Makerere University, Uganda</b>