

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript addresses the agricultural sector, which is often overlooked in discussions of occupational safety and health. It has relevant objectives and is well-structured to cover the necessary information under this title. The focus on the agricultural sector highlights important health risks that workers face, emphasizing the need for targeted safety measures. By addressing these gaps in research, the manuscript contributes valuable insights that could improve overall work safety.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, it is suitable.	
<b>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.</b>	No amendments are required in the abstract, which is clear, concise, and compact.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, the subsections are clearly structured	
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its clear methodology, rigorous data collection, and thorough analysis. The quantitative data enhances the overall validity of this study. The results and discussion have a great explanation structured and has used a methodology which defines the objectives well. The parameters that were chosen demonstrate a significant relationship with one another, producing continuous and meaningful insights.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, sufficient	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, it is suitable, and no revision need to be made.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adding about the calibration of the device would be a better option</li> <li>• Figures should be individually captioned for better understand and reading.</li> <li>• A questionnaire could have added into this research to understand if there are any changes felt by the worker before and after using the sunscreen.</li> <li>• Results and discussion - Heat mapping should have considered to visualise for betterment of the results explanation</li> </ul>	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Thiruvengadish Sundaraju</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Malaya (University of Malaya), Malaysia</b>