

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_101977</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Design and Development of Green Energy Based Evaporative Cooled Transit Storage Unit for Horticultural Products</b>
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> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. This manuscript is of scientific importance because it was about development of an eco-friendly fruit carrying tricycle using renewable energy, which is in line with the current global aim for greenhouse gas emission reductions.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is already good, but it should be slightly modified. It should be rewritten as <b>“Design and Development of Green Energy-based Evaporative Cooling Transit Storage Unit for Horticultural Products”</b></p> <p>3. The abstract is already good.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is.</p> <p>5. This manuscript is very beneficial in scientific terms because it was structured in a way that connects the design and development of the transit unit to the result. However, there were some missing information in the text. That includes the experimental period and the instruments used for testing vegetable quality because they were not mentioned.</p> <p>6. In terms of references, the writer cited so many references; it is marvellous. However, in the first paragraph of the introduction, there are no references, which can weaken the supporting statement for the manuscript. It is suggested that the writer should find more references to support that.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The author has shown a very good command of English writing, but there are some grammatical mistakes. Comments have already been given in the text.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This manuscript should be accepted for publication because it is a kind of invention that should be known and applied in the real world if it is applicable.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hin Lyhour
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia