

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript should be considered a minireview paper about the importance and effect of the destruction of coral reefs on the environment and human life. The manuscript emphasizes the most important aspects of coral reefs without deepen into any topic specific.</p> <p>The title of the work is consistent with its content, and the abstract adequately summarizes what is addressed in the work.</p> <p>The manuscript sections are according to the presentation, since it is not a scientific work itself, the structure is organized according to the topics covered.</p> <p>The manuscript should improve the scientific rigor by including more references. Many sentences don't have bibliographic support. More up-to-date quotes should also be included. In one sentence the authors mention "recent studies" however they cite papers from 2000. I think that 23 years cannot be considered recent.</p> <p>Due to the importance and emphasis given to the topic addressed, much more current references should be included.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are aspects of the language that should also be improved, some sentences are unclear.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript addresses a topic of current interest and concern, although it does so in a general way, without focusing on some aspects. The most weakness about the paper is the lack of references in some statements and the fact that they are out of date. Much more recent paper should be cited, which reveal the importance and current situation of the problem raised. Additional comments were included in the MS.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Valeria Gómez
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina