

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_125878
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of changing temperature and CO2 concentration on weed dynamics and behaviour: A Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

**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)
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.	The journal, which has also a focus on agricultural sustainability in the era of environmental change also closely resembles this study. Knowledge of how climate change affects weed dynamics is essential for designing adaptive management practices. The research supports our mission to grow knowledge and promotes understanding the environment as well.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Review articles still follow the typical sequence: Introduction (background / objectives), Methodology (systematic review / scoping review / critical review or others), Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. This would meet the conventional expectations of academic rigor and thoroughness typically required in scholarly publications.	
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.	I suggest 1.1 to 1.7 be relabeled as sections in the results and discussion. Also, discussions are lengthy. Inputs from similar literature may be synthesized to shorten lengthy discussions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Minor revision is suggested.	

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

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kevin Client B. Matutes</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mindanao State University at Naawan, Philippines</b>