

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98846
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate Change and Sustainable Development Practices: A Bibliometric Study
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	Yes  Yes  No. It is the writing style that needs to change.  No. Suggestions were provided to guide the author.  Yes. But it is slightly misaligned.  Yes.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The author uses personal views to develop an analogy on climate change. Understanding on this issue is not thorough and with this, no discussion could be drawn. Guidance was provided and this would lead to 60 % changes in the article. In view of the corrections needed and time demanded, major revision is suggested.	

### PART 2:

	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>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:	Bryan Raveen Nelson
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Malaysia