

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_118417
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Jalisco's vulnerability to climate change
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research is Important because it provides valuable insights into the specific vulnerabilities of a region to the impacts of climate change. Understanding these vulnerabilities can help inform policy decisions, adaptation strategies, and resource allocation to mitigate the effects of climate change on the local population and environment. 2. Yes, the title "assessment of Jalisco's vulnerability to climate change" is suitable for this research article. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive 4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. Yes, judging from the objectives, analysis and results, I can say that the manuscript findings is scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient enough and can be said to be 55%-60% with references from 2018 to 2023 forming about 60% of the total references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The manuscript is educative and a novel work so to say. I highly recommend that this article be published in your reputable journal. Thanks.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amafade Ughwe Goodluck
Department, University & Country	Delta State University, Nigeria