

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97891
Title of the Manuscript:	COP27-Making A case for a net zero-carbon emissions future VIA Technological Solutions and mindset transformation
Type of the Article	Policy 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 REVISION</b> 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>	1. The impact of climate change due to carbon emissions has become a concern in many countries. Therefore, a framework paper that integrates technology and mobilizes the transformation of people's mindsets to overcome and adapt to climate change is significant for the scientific community. 2. The title of the article is appropriate, but the word VIA in the title is difficult to understand what does it mean?  3. Abstract has not yet adopted the method used  4. Subsections and the structure of the manuscript need to be added to the appropriate methodology.  5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct  6. Yes, the references are sufficient and up-to-date but it is necessary to add Standard Setting (SSO) references to manage the technical standards that form the basis for many sectors of technology and the economy.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. The quality of the language/English of the article is suitable for scientific communication, however, it is necessary to pay attention to the use of punctuation marks. please re-read the script.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The overall text is quite good, but it is also advisable to explain the methods used.	

### 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:	Pribadyo
Department, University & Country	Teuku Umar University, Indonesia