

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96059
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Determining Adoption of Climate-friendly Oxo-Biodegradable Napkins among women in India
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>)

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? 2. Is the title of the article suitable? 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>	<p>The manuscript is good and it can be accepted for publication once major revisions have been made as commented.</p> <p>1. COMMENT The manuscript is importance since introduction of these napkins will have a tremendous effect on environmental conservation. It will also try to remove barriers that might deter the acceptability of the napkins</p> <p>2.COMMENT The title is suitable for the article</p> <p>3.COMMENT The abstract needs to be revisited. It should have the following subsections, Background, Methods, Results, Conclusion. There is a need to make sure that all the key results are summarised and reflected in the abstract.</p> <p>4. COMMENT The document should be revised and have the following subsections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A well-structured abstract: this should have Background, aim or objectives, methods, results and conclusion in a summary format. You can refer to other scientific papers on how best to draft an abstract. 2. Introduction: The last paragraphs of the introduction should have the hypothesis, research questions and objectives clearly outlining why this study was conducted or what necessitated that the study should be conducted. The authors have been using Indian terms or phrases in the manuscript. It is important if these terms are replaced by conventional terms or phrases. Otherwise some phrases need to be defined. 3. Research methodology: This section should have the following subsections under it; Study site and why this site was chosen, the target population and its definition, Sample size estimation and how the sample size was derived, the sampling techniques for enrolling study participants, the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study, data management including analysis and ethical clearance by an accredited ethics body. 4. Results: There is a need to make sure that the tables are presented in a standard scientific format. The authors are encouraged to read extensively on how tables are presented in a scientific manuscript. 5. Discussion: The manuscript does not have a discussion session. There is a need to make sure that this is included in the document and that the results are discussed based on already existing literature and the implications that they might have in the field of science. This section will need to have references hence the number of references will need to increase. <p>5. COMMENT: The document is scientifically sound, there is a need to make major revisions as suggested above as it misses other subsections.</p> <p>6. COMMENT The references are not enough, they might increase with the inclusion of a discussion session.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is good, there is still a need that the authors should engage a language expert to proof read the document.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are no additional comments</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> There is a need to indicate the ethical clearance reference number in the document and the ethical board that reviewed this.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tisungane Edward Mwenenkulu
Department, University & Country	Malawi