

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98036
Title of the Manuscript:	Climatic factors affecting water quality under natural conditions: a field survey of a local reservoir
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Climate change and the protection of wetlands will be possible with the increase in the work done in these areas and the richness of the content. It is thought that the current study will provide important basic information to the scientific community in understanding the effects of changing climatic conditions on wetlands.</li> <li>2. The title is too general and not informative about the content.</li> <li>3. The abstract of the article explains the topic.</li> <li>4. The method used in the study is suitable for the subject.</li> </ol> <p>Tables and figures are understandable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The article is scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. There are references from recent years.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	It is written in a clear and understandable language.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Considering that the parameters measured in the study were gathered from a depth of 1 m, regarding other studies in the field conducted in the past, it is possible that the change will not be evident even at the level of raw data, let alone to expect it to be statistically significant. Example: Table 1, the average dissolved oxygen values measured from the surface and the bottom in the 2nd week of June in Nagao Pond are similar to each other. The reason why a deeper lake was not selected in the study area preference should be stated in the text. The study is self-sufficient and consistent in terms of limnology; suitable for scientific publication.	

### 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Esin Poyrazoğlu
Department, University & Country	Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Türkiye