



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_41860
Title of the Manuscript:	EUROPEAN ATMOSPHERIC CIRCULATION CLASSIFICATIONS
Type of the Article	Short communication

**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**

	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	<p>The manuscript is about the European atmospheric circulation classifications submitted to the Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International.</p> <p><b>Below are my comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The writing is generally clear, but the major problem of this study is the references, several statement need to be referenced,</li> <li>• In abstract section, please, GWL in full</li> <li>• The used literature is outdated. The paper lacks referencing, particularly in the Introduction and the Discussion sections.</li> <li>• Besides several serious language and formal issues, it lacks a clear delineation of the study purpose, the methods, and results presentation. Additionally, the manuscript is not well fitted in the current research. The used literature is outdated. The paper lacks referencing, particularly in the Introduction and the Discussion sections.</li> <li>• Explain why is such work useful / necessary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complete the abstract with the practical implications of your findings.</li> <li>- The motivation of the study is not clearly defined,</li> <li>- Please explain how this study advances our knowledge in this domain.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The authors should keep the following rules: Each table and each figure have to be self-understandable. The reader should get a first impression of the relevance of a contribution only by studying the tables and figures, and without reading the paper sections (Table 2: HME, TME ; Fig. 3. and table 2, Table 3: GWL),</li> <li>• This manuscript has not a scientific discussion section; the authors must discuss the results and compare with other new and relevant references.</li> <li>• Please format your references. The references have been prepared in a manner not consistent with the instructions for authors,</li> <li>• The paper needs thorough language editing (Please check the manuscript carefully for the correction of the English).</li> </ul>	Thanks a lot to the reviewer for useful comments. They are all corrected.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		