

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_125756
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATING THE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION POTENTIAL DUE TO CONSTRUCTION WORK ON THE 225 kV SEGOU - BAMAKO HIGH VOLTAGE BI-TERNAL ELECTRIC LINE IN MALI IN A CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 manuscript is important for the scientific community as it contributes valuable insights into greenhouse gas emission, potentially advancing current knowledge and offering new perspectives on [specific scientific area]. It demonstrates thorough research, a well-structured methodology, and meaningful results, which can serve as a foundation for future studies. I appreciate the manuscript's clarity, logical flow, and its potential impact on both theoretical and practical applications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear, and informative, giving readers an immediate understanding of the key topics covered.	
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.	The abstract is a critical summary of the article that convey the purpose, methodology, key findings, and significance of the research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript follow a logical progression, typically starting with an Introduction followed by Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion sections.	
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.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its strong methodological framework and comprehensive data analysis. The research question is clearly defined, and the methodology used is appropriate for addressing the objectives. Additionally, the manuscript presents data that is well-supported by rigorous statistical techniques, ensuring the reliability of the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is written in clear, professional language that effectively conveys the key ideas and research findings. However, there may be minor instances where sentence structure or word choice could be improved for better clarity and flow	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suraj. E. S
Department, University & Country	KCT Business School, India