

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_107209 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A Comprehensive Report On Environmental Sustainability: A Global Perspective |
| Type of the Article | |

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>Overall impression</p> <p>-This paper looks more of a synthesis or academic report. It currently does not befit research or review article as it lacks several details. Authors need to substantially improve the manuscript based on the critical comments raised or highlighted.</p> <p>-Several grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified throughout the manuscript that need to be revised or corrected.</p> <p>-The paper does not look adequately formatted. Authors are advised to adhere to the journal's format, look for review or synthesis reports and structure their paper accordingly.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>-Authors are advised to reduce the length of the abstract to less than or at most 250 words. Precision and brevity are needed to coax readers.</p> <p>-The abstract needs to be re-structured or revised. It is still unclear what the main or specific objective of this study is. Similarly, what approach or method/model/framework was used to analyze the data used?</p> <p>-What are the main findings and what is the relevance of study findings in the concluding sentence.</p> <p>Authors need to revise or re-organize the abstract. The current abstract is unacceptable and inappropriate. All I see is kind of a background to the subject.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>-Authors need to revise the introduction and literature thoroughly or substantially. They need to cite or reference (i.e., provide substantial in-text citations) where necessary. Most of the ideas presented have sources or were birthed from someone and not from them. I advise they cite appropriately.</p> <p>-What is the rationale behind the study?</p> <p>-The research progress and theories anchoring this study must be highlighted clearly and linked to the study objectives.</p> <p>-Authors are advised to look for similar articles or synthesis/review reports and tailor the sections accordingly.</p> <p>Fig captions are placed under the figures.</p> <p>The paper could be designed to follow this format:</p> <p>-Review of literature; Materials and methods (data source, type of data used, approach utilized for data analysis and so on); Results and discussion (i.e., details of findings are presented and discussed against existing literature) and Recommendations/propositions.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>-Clearly disorganized and inappropriate. This does not befit a scientific paper. It must briefly capture the main aim, summarize key findings, highlight study limitations or opportunities for future studies,</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | relevance of findings and so on. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | References -Major proficiency errors or defects were spotted throughout the manuscript. -Authors should revised or correct incomplete and wrong references. The references listed are not uniform. Please check and adhere to the format of the journal. Other details are given in track changes. | |
| Optional/General comments | Though the topic presents an interesting area, the current status of the manuscript does not befit a review/synthesis report. Authors need to format the paper according to the journal's standard, cite and improve flow, re-organize the sections and provide some additional details in virtually all the sections. I recommend a rejection or reconsideration after critically and substantially revising this paper. | |

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Isaac Sarfo |
| Department, University & Country | College of Geography and Environmental Science, Henan University, China |