



**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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Authors might want to go over the text one more time to remove small typos.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The authors use models for climate prediction that have provenly failed to predict the climate. However, there is nothing technically wrong in doing so. They use a certain black box calculator that spews out data for their region of interest and they simply summarize the data. Authors should refrain from strongly claiming that this actually has any predictive power. They should just state that this is what is predicted so that later we can use it to show the black box has, once again, failed.</p> <p>Alternatively, they must show how this black box has been faring until now. Without this proof of predicting power, the manuscript has all aspects of a work of Nostradamus, the famous 16<sup>th</sup> century soothsayer whose predictions failed. All of them.</p> <p>Otherwise, other researchers might actually mistake this summary for the truth about the future and start basing policies on the work. That is a dangerous development, also for Punjab.</p> <p>To give an example about the level of the black box (and summary here): "RCP predicts that mean annual temperature would increase by 1.56°C". This statement is ludicrous. No error bar is give, so we can estimate it from the precision given: plus or minus 0.01°C. The temperature of the past cannot be presented with this accuracy, how can future predictions have such a high quality? Do the authors really want to claim the increase will not be 1.54°C?!</p>	

**PART 2:**



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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><i>Peter Stallinga</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University of the Algarve, Portugal</i></b>