

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_99971</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Contemporary Review on Geo-engineering Techniques for Mitigation of Accelerated Rise in Global Sea Level in The Past Eight Hottest Years</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but the topic and title could have been adjusted better.</li> <li>To some extent yes! But the title could have been adjusted better and much more concise. For as an example the title could have been entitled as: "A Recent Review on Geo-engineering Techniques for Mitigation of Accelerated Rise in Global Sea Level"</li> <li>No. The Research Area, Aims and Goals, Methodology, Future Research Topics and as such sections are not mentioned in the abstract. For this reason this sections could be added to the abstract.</li> <li>To some extent yes. Although the "research methodology" can be recognized by professional researchers and scientists but the "Research Methodology" Section should have been added to the manuscript by the author for researchers to as quickly as possible get know what the exact method is and there will be no need to spend time on understanding the research methodology. Scientifically speaking the research methodology section should be added to the manuscript in details.</li> <li>To some extent yes. After consideration of the review comments it seems it would be suitable enough to be published.</li> <li>Yes, it seems appropriate. But in relation to risk management and mitigation some more recent references can be reviewed by the author to enrich the manuscript</li> <li>In relation to the Keywords, some terms can be added such as: Geo-engineering Techniques, Risk Management, Disaster management, Climate Change, Mitigation. Of course among these proposed keywords the author can prioritize them as to meet the aims and goals of the article enhancing the scientific research for the researchers, the scientists and all those interested in the topic.</li> <li>The figures used on pages 2 and 3 better be replaced by a higher resolution figures and much more detailed pictures can also be used by the Authors. On the other hand the <b>exact</b> source and reference of the 1<sup>st</sup> figure on page 2 should have been mentioned since if it's not mentioned! For this I kindly request the author to mention the references.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It seems good, but it needs to be edited from literal and technical point of view.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bijan Yavar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Allameh Tabataba'i University, Iran</b>