



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_22017
Title of the Manuscript:	Signs of uncooperative climate also emerging for the Arctic sea ice
Type of the Article	Commentary

**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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The work is very interesting and relevant to the current climate context, considering the climate change effects at the poles. However I have some questions that may to help with article. First is that throughout the text, there are quotes from a natural variability that determine this variation in ice extent variability, who this phenomenon?</p> <p>This variability cited in the text would be associated with the North Atlantic or the Arctic oscillations? For no relationship between these oscillations and their effects on ice extent variability in the Arctic it has not been raised, as both directly and indirectly influence regional weather patterns.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The abbreviations can be mentioned so described, for example PIOMAS and NSIDC been cited in the first page and the third page just described. An abbreviation has no description, CCGS on second page, line 27.</p> <p>Regarding the images, these could be better identified, for example Figures 1A and 1B could be at the upper left. As in Figure 2, both the Figure illustration as the caption were not clear. I suggest that if the data these figures are hosted on sites that they be redone, and only indicating the origin of the legend, getting better visually, without any distortion.</p> <p>In addition, another significant detail is the inclusion of magazine articles, it could confirm these evidences, since the 21 citations, only 8 are scientific articles.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Washington L. F. Correia Filho</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Departamento de Ciencias Atmosfericas e Climaticas, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil</b>