

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_120214</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Demystifying Polyhouse Microclimates: A Review of Modelling Tools and Strategies</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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is relevant to the community of scientific researchers as it addresses the conditioning of climates for crop production both in and out of season.</li> <li>2. It also explains the influence of greenhouse (both natural and particularly artificial) in meeting the challenges of food supply shortages.</li> <li>3. The research work endeavour to bring to notice the basic factors of Polyhouse Microclimates.</li> <li>4. So as well the artificial construction of a greenhouse with microclimates prerequisites.</li> </ol>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, provided that the required and the suggested corrections are made.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>It is important to let the writer(s) understand that the "ABSTRACT" section is not limited to introduction alone, rather the comprehensive summary of the full paper. Hence, the following considerations are the embodiments of a good abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reason for writing</li> <li>2. Comprehensively stating the problem.</li> <li>3. Methodology of approach as employed.</li> <li>4. The findings and or the results derived.</li> <li>5. Implications: it values to body of knowledge in terms of theoretical and practical applications.</li> </ol> <p>All these need to be concisely (with the accepted number of words) and comprehensively put forward in the abstract of the work. Furthermore, as informative and descriptive as necessary.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure and sections of a well-prepared manuscript should come with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An informative introduction with the general background of the work.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive literature review (aligned with the introduction).</li> <li>3. Methodology with the approaching techniques.</li> <li>4. Finding and Results (as no data in use) bringing out the novelty even in the case of a review paper.</li> <li>5. Proffer solutions by recommendations, then reach conclusion.</li> </ol>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is yet to be scientifically robust and sound. Meaningful figures, diagrams and tables have to be introduced when concepts are put forward and not just wordings. A research paper "CANNOT" be written and presented as essay.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>It appears that the references are good enough.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It appears that writer(s) possess good command of English. Nevertheless, more efforts can be made.	
Optional/General comments	Carefully studying the manuscript, I cannot but rather emphasize that the structure and sections of a review paper should come with the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. An informative introduction with the general background of the work.</li><li>2. A comprehensive literature review (aligned with the introduction).</li><li>3. Methodology with the approaching techniques.</li><li>4. Finding and Results (as no data in use) bringing out the novelty even in the case of a review paper.</li></ol> The writer(s) have to be able to suggest solutions by giving comprehensive recommendations, then reach conclusion.	

### **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:	<b>Oluwole Joseph Oladunni</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Durban University of Technology, South Africa</b>