

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_108206
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of Heat Stress among Greenhouse Workers in Chhattisgarh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical issue – the impact of heat stress on greenhouse workers in a changing climate. The research contributes valuable insights into the challenges faced by agricultural workers, which have broader implications for occupational health and climate change adaptation. The findings can inform policy and practice in safeguarding the well-being of these workers.</p> <p>The title, "Investigation of Heat Stress among Greenhouse Workers in Chhattisgarh", is appropriate as it accurately reflects the core focus of the research. It clearly conveys the subject matter and the geographical context of the study. No alternative title suggestions are needed.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. It effectively summarizes the research objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. It provides a clear overview of the study's significance and findings, making it accessible to readers who want a quick understanding of the research. Importantly, consider discussing the limitations of the study and potential avenues for future research in the conclusion.</p> <p>The manuscript is well-structured with clear subsections that guide the reader through the research process. The sections, including Introduction, Material and Method, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion, are appropriately organized. The use of figures and tables enhances the readability.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The methodology used to collect and analyze data seems robust. The data is presented clearly, and the conclusions are well-supported by the evidence. The discussion is sound and grounded in relevant literature.</p> <p>The references in the manuscript are relevant and provide credibility to the research. However, to further enhance the robustness of the study, you might consider including more recent references, particularly in the Introduction and Discussion sections, where you discuss the impact of climate change on health. Look for recent studies or reports on the specific impact of climate change on occupational health and heat stress to strengthen the background and context of your research.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Regarding the language/English quality of the article, I must clarify that the paper seems to be well-written and generally suitable for scholarly communication. The language is clear, and the writing is coherent, which is crucial for effective scholarly communication. However, there are a few minor grammatical errors that needs to be enhanced for its overall quality. I would advise you to proofread and correct all grammatical errors.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michael Atuahene Djan
Department, University & Country	University of Nebraska, USA