

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104040
Title of the Manuscript:	Forecasting of resin yield and number of blazes of naturally regenerated chir pine (Pinus roxburghii Sargent) in Himachal Pradesh by using single exponential smoothing method
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript could be important for the scientific community to bring in an intervention that will lead to effective management of the naturally regenerated chir pines in forecasting of resin yield and number of blazes in the formulation of strategies as well as formulation or review of policies that are relevant to enable the community benefit from the pines economically. 2. The title appears to be in order as it is sounding well and catchy though long and the message is clear and loud. 3. The abstract appears to be well thought of as it has provided most of the important information. The Author is, however, requested to consider shorting a bit the methodology part and include challenges and proposed way forward, just to mention a few. An abstract is supposed to be a shorter version of the main report that can guide a reader to read the whole document or not. 4. The structure of the manuscript appears to be a traditional one and is in order. 5. Basing on the data and facts presented, I feel it's scientifically correct. Some facts presented were observed to be difficult to tell/establish the message and there are some facts that need to be backed with facts and data to make an informed judgement. Avoid short sentences that cannot connect the dots or making sense as well as repetition of facts. Comments in track changes of the document may help the Author in some cases. 6. Note that some of the facts presented in the document need to be backed up by references. <p>The manuscript has a total of only 3 references and all the 3 have been used. However, there is need to review reference number 2 for consistency of names used. Basing on the number of references, I feel the author did not put much effort in the literature review of the subject matter as 3 references for a manuscript appears to be on the lower side.</p> <p>The conclusion part appears to include useful information but I feel the author could have done much better than this when compared to what is in the Abstract. Note that a Conclusion is supposed to summarise the report as a whole, drawing inferences from the whole process about what has been found in line with the aim/objective of the study, or decided, and the impact of those findings or decisions.</p> <p>All the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols should be written in full followed by the abbreviations/acronyms themselves when they appear in the document for the first time, thereafter, the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols can be used.</p> <p>Consider numbering all the Sections and sub-sections including the reference Section or adding page numbers for easy referencing.</p> <p>Tables and Figures need to be properly introduced and allocate closer to where the discussion is in the sections.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

<p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The answer could be no as well as yes and comments have been made to this regard in the main document and please refer to the comments in track changes.</p> <p>Proofreading of the whole document to correct the grammar, typos, tenses etc including rephrasing/reconstruction of some sentences as well as taking out repeated statements.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Consider defining some words to let the reader follow the write up easily like “resins, blazes” what they are used for etc”.</p> <p>A literature review covers things that are relevant to the topic of study and is often an examination of what research has already been done in an area to identify where further research could be conducted or which recommendations could be made. I feel such understanding is not there in this Manuscript and the Author may consider doing so in this Manuscript or the next one to propose. No doubt that the Manuscript is not rich in the references as it has a total of three references I am not sure if this could be in order.</p> <p>A number of comments have been made in all sections. I feel the manuscript could be under the minor revision range as most of the facts that need to be corrected/reviewed are not so complicated if considered to be making sense by the Author. All in all, the manuscript needs to be repaired basing on the deficiencies, some of which have been mentioned in addition to the track changes provided in the attached document may be of help to the author.</p> <p>It is a good study that can help in the management of the trees in general and naturally regenerated chir pines for the good of the community and the government/country in terms of boosting economy and empowering the community financially. However, there is a need to provide more details to the study and this should include the problems/challenges as well as the proposed way forward based on the experience generated from the study and other studies done in the region and beyond as evidenced by the references included.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>James Peaches Phiri</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Malawi</p>