

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99621
Title of the Manuscript:	EMERGING WEED PROBLEMS UNDER CHANGING CLIMATIC CONDITION – A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>1. It seems to me that the manuscript is important for the scientific community since it tries to establish the relationship between emerging weed problems under changing climatic</p> <p>2. I think the title is appropriate</p> <p>3. The summary shows the basic elements of the investigation, or what the summary is pertinent, although it could be improved.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is not adequate. It is not clear how the revision was made and how it was structured. There does not seem to be a logical sequence of the subject matter.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, it only remains in the literature review, since the possible causes of correlation between the correlated variables are not explained. I think it could be enriched and given a scope that is at least correlative and supported. Also, the conclusion is general and limited. Further conclusions could be drawn from the results.</p> <p>6. The 86 % of the references are more than 10 years old</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English language used is understandable and sufficient for most readers to understand the purpose and results of the article.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	You should try to make the review more orderly, explain what was the methodology for bibliographic consultations and the extraction of the most important of each reviewed literature, give order and sequence to the writing. Also conclude about the different aspects found in the literature and that most of the references consulted are less than 10 years old.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hermes Ulises Ramirez Sanchez
Department, University & Country	Universidad De Guadalajara, Mexico