

### 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	

#### **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	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Importance of poly house concept in agriculture industry is well conceived. The possible models well narrated.  Is it acceptable to have questions in research papers as part of flow of text – Doubted Is it acceptable to have no space between two sentence – editing may required	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Is it acceptable to have questions in research papers as part of flow of text – Doubted Is it acceptable to have no space between two sentence – editing may require	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	More than sufficient, Shall be mentioned as excess (incorporated more than what it is mentioned in the flow of text)	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, grammar may be ascertained	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>B.Ravinder</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>NICMAR, India</b>