

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95664
Title of the Manuscript:	Threat to the sustainable production of natural resins: A case of rangeeni strain of Kerria lacca (Kerr) in Eastern Plateau & Hills Region of South East Asia
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, the manuscript is important and the conclusions can contribute to the production and sustainable use of natural resins. 2. Yes, that's right. 3. No, it lacks an ordered sequence based on objectives, methodology, results and conclusions. 4. Yes, the structure of the document is valid, what must be corrected is the structure of the ideas in the development of the subsections. Antecedents cannot be included in results; they go in the introduction and in the literature review from which it is discussed. In conclusions, assumptions refer to the loss of yield that can be avoided with treatment and pest management, says the document, which is incorrect, because these aspects have not been tested with the study. 5. With the corrections, better systematization, the objectives do not appear precisely in the introduction, not all the results correspond to all the objectives and the conclusions lack precision. 6. It could be enriched with recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The wording, precision and systematization must be improved.	
Optional/General comments	Review the wording of the document to accurately communicate results.	

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:	Ysabel Meza
Department, University & Country	Perú