

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96717
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of environmental parameters and occupational health hazards of rural women in post harvest activities of Assam
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>)

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. Research idea was very good and it is very imp for scientific community 2. Title is suitable and appropriate 3. The abstract is comprehensive 4. In methodology part and result part subsections and paragraphs may be re arranged for further smart writing of the paper 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct 6. New or recent references are not seen. Web references are also absent, addition of few recent related work may make the manuscript more reliable and acceptable	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The author may go through the discussion part, as there is few flaws of English language.	
Optional/General comments	The paper is too big unnecessarily, it may be reduced to make it smart and crispy In methodology part more clarification needed, sampling is inappropriate	

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:	Diptendu Chatterjee
Department, University & Country	University of Calcutta, India