

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_113705
Title of the Manuscript:	Heat and Associated Health Risks in Delhi
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper provides a good overview of the impact of rising temperatures and heat waves on public health, specifically in the context of Delhi, India. It utilizes relevant data on temperature, humidity, land surface temperature, and health outcomes to assess these relationships. • The introduction effectively sets the context by reviewing literature on climate change impacts globally and in South Asian cities, with a focus on health effects. The city profile section also helps frame Delhi's specific vulnerabilities. <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of multiple indicators related to heat and temperature (air temperature, heat index, land surface temperature) to provide a robust characterization of heat patterns in Delhi over time. • Correlation analysis conducted between annual heat index and all-cause mortality data to demonstrate the association between rising heat and mortality. • Mapping of intra-city land surface temperature differences at the district level to identify spatial variability in heat impacts within Delhi. • Analysis of correlations between land surface temperature and incidence of various heat-sensitive health outcomes like stroke, diabetes etc. based on hospitalization data. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scientifically the manuscript talks about an important topic 2. The title is suitable and clear 3. The abstract is comprehensive, well structured, and well written. 4. The structure must be redone according to an agreed upon method. 5. Scientifically the manuscript needs improvements and restructuration. 6. References are sufficient and updated. 7. The conclusion is too poor regarding the interest of the work; the conclusion must be rewritten. Because the conclusion is intended to help the reader to understand why your research should matter to them after they have finished reading the paper. A conclusion is not merely a summary of your points or a re-statement of your research problem, but a synthesis of key points. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>A conclusion should contain these points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restate the problem statement addressed in the paper • Summarize your overall arguments or findings • Suggest the key takeaways from your paper <p>8. In order to enhance the comprehensibility and coherence of the methodology section, it is advisable to incorporate a well-defined research framework. This framework should serve the purpose of not only synthesizing but also providing a clear and structured explanation of the two key subsections within the methodology: data collection and data analysis. By doing so, readers will gain a more thorough understanding of how these components interact and contribute to the overall research process.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable	
Optional/General comments	///	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Atef Ahriz
Department, University & Country	Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University, Algeria