

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_112001
Title of the Manuscript:	Improved biomass stoves in rural area -A boon
Type of the 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>
--	---------------------------	---

Review Form 1.7

<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the critical issue of household air pollution (HAP) caused by inefficient combustion of solid fuels in traditional stoves. The study provides valuable insights into the health impacts of HAP and the effectiveness of improved biomass stoves in reducing harmful emissions. The findings have significant implications for public health, environmental sustainability, and energy policy, making it a relevant and important contribution to the scientific community.2. The title "Improved biomass stoves in rural area - A boon" is suitable as it effectively conveys the focus of the study on the positive impact of improved biomass stoves in rural areas. An alternative title could be "Enhancing Health and Sustainability: The Impact of Improved Biomass Stoves in Rural Communities."3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the study, including the background, methodology, and key results. The abstract effectively summarizes the importance of the research, the study design, and the main findings, making it a comprehensive representation of the article's content.4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The document is well-organized with clear sections such as abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. This structure effectively presents the research findings and allows for easy navigation through the study's components. Overall, the manuscript's subsections and structure are well-suited for conveying the research content.5. Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It presents a detailed study design, methodology, and results, providing a comprehensive analysis of the impact of improved biomass stoves in rural areas. The data and findings are presented in a manner consistent with scientific research standards, indicating scientific rigor in the study.6. The references provided in the manuscript are relevant to the study and contribute to the scientific context of the research. The inclusion of references such as Legros et al. (2009) and Kumari et al. (2011) adds credibility to the study's background and findings. However, to enhance the comprehensiveness of the references, it may be beneficial to include more recent sources that specifically address the impact of improved biomass stoves on health and environmental sustainability. For example, including recent publications from reputable sources such as the World Health Organization or other relevant research articles on biomass stoves could further strengthen the scientific foundation of the study. <p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into the impact of improved biomass stoves in rural areas. However, to further enhance the manuscript, the following suggestions can be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clarification on Statistical Analysis: While the manuscript mentions the use of statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, and t-test, providing more details on the specific statistical analyses conducted and their outcomes would add depth to the research findings.2. Inclusion of Limitations: It would be beneficial to include a section addressing the limitations of the study. This could involve discussing any constraints or challenges encountered during the research process, which would provide a more balanced perspective on the findings.3. Policy Implications: The manuscript could benefit from a section discussing the potential policy implications of the research. Exploring how the findings could inform or influence government policies related to clean cooking technologies and environmental sustainability would add practical relevance to the study.4. Visual Aids: Incorporating visual aids such as graphs, charts, or tables to represent the data and findings could enhance the clarity and accessibility of the results for readers.	
---	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	Overall, the manuscript effectively highlights the importance of improved biomass stoves in rural areas. Addressing these suggestions could further strengthen the research and its contribution to the field.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The document is well-written and effectively conveys the research findings and methodology. However, there are a few instances of grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that could be improved for greater clarity and precision. Overall, while the language quality is adequate, some minor revisions for grammar and sentence structure could enhance the scholarly communication of the article.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript provides valuable insights into the impact of improved biomass stoves in rural areas. The study design, methodology, and results are presented in a clear and organized manner, contributing to the scholarly communication of the research. However, there are opportunities to further enhance the manuscript by addressing specific statistical analyses, including a section on limitations, discussing policy implications, and incorporating visual aids to represent the data. Additionally, while the language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communications, some minor revisions for grammar and sentence structure could improve clarity. Overall, the manuscript makes a significant contribution to the understanding of improved biomass stoves and their impact, and with some refinements, it has the potential to further strengthen its scholarly communication.	

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:	Asim Aamir
Department, University & Country	Institute of Process Engineering, Chinese Academy of Sciences, UCAS, China