

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_124323
Title of the Manuscript:	Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Consumption in the garments, textile, and dyeing sectors in Dhakas
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant to the scientific community as it highlights the critical issue of greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption within Bangladesh's garment, textile, and dyeing industries, which are essential sectors in developing economies. The study provides valuable data on energy use trends and GHG contributions from 2019 to 2021, emphasizing the growing need for sustainable energy practices. I appreciate the manuscript's clear focus on the environmental impact and its call for cleaner technologies and policy improvements to mitigate emissions, which is essential for addressing global climate change challenges.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Consumption in the garments textile and dyeing sectors in Dhaka" is suitable as it clearly reflects the core focus of the study. However, a more specific title could be: "Evaluating Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Consumption Trends in the Garments, Textile, and Dyeing Industries of Savar, Dhaka (2019-2021)." This revision adds detail about the study's timeframe and location, enhancing clarity.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive, as it outlines the key focus areas, including energy consumption patterns and greenhouse gas emissions in the garments, textile, and dyeing industries of Dhaka between 2019 and 2021. It also highlights important findings, such as the rise in GHG emissions and the limited adoption of solar energy. However, I would suggest adding a clearer statement about the study's objectives and methodologies to provide readers with a more complete overview of the research approach. Additionally, consider simplifying some technical details for better readability.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure is appropriate and well-organized. It follows a logical progression, starting with an abstract, moving through a detailed introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and concluding with a strong summary of findings. The subsections are clear, with distinct headings such as "Energy Consumption" and "Greenhouse Gas Emissions," which make it easier to follow the study's flow. Each section effectively contributes to the overall narrative of energy use and GHG emissions in the garment, textile, and dyeing industries.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its clear methodology and rigorous approach. It uses both primary and secondary data to assess energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions in the textile and dyeing industries, adhering to the IPCC guidelines for GHG calculations. The manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis by evaluating trends over a three-year period (2019-2021), using recognized methods like the Tier 1 and Tier 2 approaches. The findings are well-supported by data and highlight key trends in energy use and emissions, making a strong case for the need for renewable energy adoption and efficiency improvements.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references in the attached document appear to cover a broad range of sources, including relevant studies from as early as 2012 to as recent as 2024, which provide a solid foundation for the research. However, some of the older references might benefit from being supplemented with newer studies, particularly for fast-evolving topics like energy transitions or renewable energy policies. Adding recent data or reports from the International Energy Agency (IEA) or newer publications related to climate change mitigation would strengthen the document further.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language in the document appears to be generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it uses formal tone, technical terminology, and a structured format, including an abstract, introduction, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, there are some instances where punctuation is missing, and the flow of certain sentences could be improved for clarity. Addressing these minor issues could enhance the overall readability and professionalism of the article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Based on the review of the manuscript titled "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Consumption in the Garments Textile and Dyeing Sectors in Dhaka," I would give it an overall score of 7.5. The manuscript provides valuable insights into the sector's energy consumption and emissions trends, with a well-structured methodology and clear results. However, it would benefit from further refinement in data presentation and a deeper discussion on the implications of its findings, particularly regarding policy and practical recommendations for sustainability improvements. Therefore, it requires major revision before it can be considered for publication</p> <p>Based on the content of the manuscript, there don't appear to be any overt ethical issues such as data fabrication, plagiarism, or conflicts of interest. However, there are a few potential areas that could be clarified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Informed Consent and Data Transparency: The study relies on primary data collection from selected industries. The manuscript does not explicitly mention whether the industries provided informed consent for data use or how confidentiality and transparency were maintained. Environmental and Social Responsibility: The focus is on greenhouse gas emissions from the textile industry, but ethical concerns related to environmental degradation and labor practices in such industries, particularly in developing countries, could be acknowledged. These are crucial from an ethical standpoint, given the environmental impact and social responsibility of industries. These aspects might warrant more explicit attention to ensure that ethical standards are <p>Based on the content of the manuscript, there don't appear to be any overt ethical issues such as data fabrication, plagiarism, or conflicts of interest. However, there are a few potential areas that could be clarified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Informed Consent and Data Transparency: The study relies on primary data collection from selected industries. The manuscript does not explicitly mention whether the industries provided informed consent for data use or how confidentiality and transparency were maintained. Environmental and Social Responsibility: The focus is on greenhouse gas emissions from the textile industry, but ethical concerns related to environmental degradation and labor practices in such industries, particularly in developing countries, could be acknowledged. These are crucial from an ethical standpoint, given the environmental impact and social responsibility of industries. These aspects might warrant more explicit attention to ensure that ethical standards are fully addressed. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Shubham Patil</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>United Kingdom</p>