

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_118930
Title of the Manuscript:	A comprehensive review on protected cultivation: Importance, Scope and Status
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://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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It is important for scientific community due to the scope of new techniques and advantages of them. Regardless, it must include a better comparison with the India and the rest of the world.</p> <p>2. It is.</p> <p>3. It is comprehensive. For paper purposes, I think that it could be rewritten with more formality.</p> <p>4. The subsections are correct, but not the structure. They could be in a better hierarchy and enlisted. Be different one from another with another size of font, underline, etc. The "Novel approaches...", "New developments..." and "Emerging patterns..." could be in the same section with a different hierarchy, for example.</p> <p>5. It is.</p> <p>6. There are sufficient and recent references.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The last paragraph of the introduction has an extra blank space at the beginning. Take care of the subindices of the chemical formulas like CO₂. Double check the grammatic and orthography of the phrases. More and specific comments in the manuscript review. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is suitable and has a good technical language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is very comprehensive but could be better or more illustrative for the lectors if the suggestions about the subsections are made.</p>	

[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:	Mario Alberto Gonzalez Lopez
Department, University & Country	Facultad de Ciencias Quimicas, UANL, Mexico