

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_125896
Title of the Manuscript:	"IMPROVING OUTDOOR THERMAL COMFORT FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS: A STUDY OF HEAT STRESS RELIEF MEASURES"
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a useful research as a similar experiment has not been conducted before under the local conditions	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	IMPROVING OUTDOOR THERMAL COMFORT FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS: A STUDY OF HEAT STRESS RELIEF using lotion	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	This is well written. Only issue is that abbreviations should be written in full	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	All is good	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Several comments in here. The use of statistical testing is to be improved. Author has come into conclusions without really testing means for instance. This is a violation of basic research methods. Why only this cream (lotion) was selected for the experiment? Is it freely available, cheap, etc.? Why only one lotion was tested? The experiment has a better value if several methods were used that enable the selection of the best method. The use of other PPE such as clothing, hats, etc. is a good option that should have been considered in this study. What is the economics of application of the lotion? It costs to procure and whether this cost can be justified needs to be answered.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Few more relevant references should be listed	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The use of language, grammar, etc. is good. Reviewer has marked few areas where it could be further improved	
Optional/General comments	It should be published after addressing 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anura Widana
Department, University & Country	New Zealand