

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_99416</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Status of Sacred Groves in India</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> )

## 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>The manuscript is not in an acceptable form. The manuscript can be considered only for publication if the author(s) revise the paper more precisely and improve the manuscript accordingly. This review paper is important for scientific community, but authors should disclose the information more scientifically.</p> <p>Presentation: not so good; need to improve.</p> <p>Abstract: Need to improve the text. Some points are not clear. Sentence structure is not so good.</p> <p>Introduction: need improvement. Use references (where truly necessary). Describe the rationale of the study. Author(s) should mention the key objectives of the review with justification.</p> <p>Methodology: As a review, author(s) can explain the procedures of secondary data/ information collection and sorting.</p> <p>Data analysis: not mentioned. Use few statistical values to justify the text. Use SWOT, figures, etc.</p> <p>Results: not okay. Some changes required. Presentation of key findings using some graphs and figures is highly instructed. Structure of this part is not appropriate. Better to use few figures.</p> <p>Discussion: Need improvement.</p> <p>Conclusion: Not mentioned in the manuscript. Recheck this part precisely. Use more text to explain the key findings precisely and recommend some effective suggestions to improve the sacred groves of India.</p> <p>References: All the references must be arranged consecutively/serially in the text for better understanding and recheck according to the journal's guidelines. Some references do not cited properly. Author(s) have to check the reference section again. Highly instructed to use more and recent reference.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several grammatical mistakes</li> <li>• Few sentence structures are not well-written, and representation is not okay. Author(s) should check the English language, typographical, grammatical errors etc. very carefully</li> <li>• Do not repeat same idea, aspect, and sentence in different paragraphs. Better to represent differently.</li> </ul> <p>In some cases, need justification.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise and improve the manuscript following the reviewer's comments before final submission</li> <li>• Major revisions required</li> <li>• Need clarification in several points.</li> <li>• Reviewer encourages the author(s) to check each and every reference precisely, and arrange it perfectly according to the Journal's format for better representation.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	

### 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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shourav Dutta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rangamati Science and Technology University, Bangladesh</b>