

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104314
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of coral reef destruction on humans and the environment
Type of the Article	Review 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Coral reef is an important ecosystem and understanding this ecosystem in depth is the need of hour. However, authors try to write a review article, but the literature survey is very weak which reflected in the manuscript.</p> <p>Can be improved.</p> <p>No. The abstract does not have a proper flow, what is the aim of writing the review, research gap, data provided, discussion on major issues and conclusion. All are lacking.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>No, author should improve the reading of literatures on the given topic, understand which are more relevant, then sort out all literature, and find the data provided by the research. Collect it and then go for review writing. The author only mentions 7 references in the whole document. There is no reference given to the many statements which are just taken from the concluding remarks of some papers and written here. But no addition of reference on such statements.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Below average.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Koushik Sadhukhan
Department, University & Country	National Centre for Coastal Research (NCCR), India