



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JGEESI_19016</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Weather forecasting: Traditional knowledge of the people of Uttarakhand Himalaya</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**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	<p>1) - The manuscript is low on referencing. Literature review on the subject is not properly sampled yet there exists enormous amount of work done in East, Southern and West Africa, Europe and Asia. UN publications have quite some works written on the topic.</p> <p>- For example between paragraph 1 and 8 there is only one reference. E.g. Line 13, 14, 42, 43, 44, and 46 as examples may need citations. The entire text needs some more and current literature review. Look at how Orlove, B., Roncoli, C., Kabugo, M., &amp; Majugu, A. (2010) <i>Indigenous climate knowledge in southern Uganda: the multiple components of a dynamic regional system. Climatic Change, 100(2), 243-265</i> have referenced introduction to their work</p> <p>-A lot is discussed on trading activities but not linked through previous literature to traditional weather forecasting. Quote some studies that link these trading activities to weather forecasting.</p> <p>2)- Order of the manuscript- Example fig 1-4 presented under methodology, line 107 needs to come under section 1.1. The images in fig. 1-4 also not very clear, text on it not seen well. The discussions of the figures need to move to the area of study.</p> <p>-Line 117 – 120 and fig 5 needs to be moved to results section. etc</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>3)- Omitted references; line 130, De Boef not referenced by number.</p> <p>4)-Methodology; Methodology not well described and referenced. What are the advantages and weaknesses of surveys, discussions, questionnaires as methods of study? What other works related to your study have used similar methods? Any ethical issues you encountered? How did you analyse your data? Which tools did you apply?</p> <p>5)-Structure of results presentation; Is it possible to present the results either in prose or tabular form instead of bullets? Perhaps the results should start at line 146. Again no or very little referencing in the results discussion for comparison purposes. Look at some work done by Roncolli et al., in Africa on indigenous weather forecasting</p>	
--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>1)-The abstracts should be written in prose without the subheadings. However it is well written and captures the objectives, study area, methodology and results.</p> <p>2)- Key words are too many. Delete some of the regions</p> <p>3)- Check factual content; a)for example line 12 when defining weather forecasting I think you could have omitted the word 'likely' before the last word of the sentence. b) line 123 defining forecasts is not entirely true. Forecasts can be of longer time scales such as short term, medium term and seasonal or longer time scales. Your monsoon forecasts in India are done for three to four months ahead.....</p> <p>4)- Paragraph starting from line 122, describing objectives of the study should move to introductory paragraphs.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>1) The English language may improvement to avoid first person singular expressions.</p> <p>2) The strengths of this manuscript is that it has very key and relevant findings that need proper presentations for documentation as most indigenous or traditional weather forecasting knowledge are not well documented across the world and seem to fade with passing memory.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kenya</b>