

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_128575
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate Change and Forests in Mexico
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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study focuses on the impact of climate change on Mexico's forests and provides a comprehensive model to assess the effects of these changes on forest resources. Given the increasing environmental crises and the critical role of forests in carbon sequestration and mitigating climate change, this research can contribute significantly to the development of sustainable forest management policies and mitigation strategies. It also highlights the regional vulnerabilities of forest ecosystems, which are essential for tailoring localized climate adaptation measures.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Climate Change and Forests in Mexico" is clear and relevant to the content of the manuscript. However, it could be made more specific to reflect the focus on regional climate change projections and their impacts on forest resources. Suggested Alternative Title: "Impacts of Climate Change on Forest Resources in Mexico: Regional Projections and Vulnerabilities"	
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 generally comprehensive, providing a good overview of the study's objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, it could be improved by including more specific details about the methodology used (e.g., mention of models or specific climate scenarios like SSP2-4.5 and SSP3-7.0) and by briefly stating the key policy recommendations derived from the findings. Additionally, the abstract could explicitly mention the regional focus on Mexico to emphasize the geographical scope. Suggested Improvements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include specific details about the methodology, such as the type of models or analysis techniques used. 2. Highlight key policy recommendations or adaptation strategies discussed in the paper. 3. Rephrase some sentences to improve clarity and conciseness, such as "regional models for Mexico show temperature increases" instead of "regional models for Mexico show temperature increases ranging from 0.5 to 5°C." 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, presenting detailed analyses of climate change scenarios and their impacts on forest ecosystems in Mexico. It uses credible sources, such as IPCC reports and regional climate models, and provides comprehensive results supported by data and visuals. However, the following points should be addressed to enhance scientific rigor: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Methodology Details: The methodology section could be more detailed regarding the specific models (e.g., CMIP6) and their calibration process for regional projections. 2. Data Interpretation: Some figures (e.g., temperature and precipitation anomalies) require additional explanation to ensure clarity for readers unfamiliar with the datasets. 3. Limitations: The manuscript should include a discussion of the limitations of the models and the uncertainties inherent in projecting climate change impacts. 4. Consistency: Ensure consistency in the presentation of units (e.g., mm, °C) and terms (e.g., SPEI12 and NDVI indices). 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you	The references in the manuscript are comprehensive and include key sources, such as IPCC reports and FAO documents,	

Review Form 3

<p>have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>ensuring the credibility of the study. However, there are a few areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recency: Some references are slightly outdated (e.g., FAO 2010, Rzedowski 1992). While they provide foundational knowledge, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies or reports from the last five years, especially regarding climate change impacts and forest management. Regional Studies: Incorporating additional studies specific to Latin America or Mexico on forest ecosystems under climate change scenarios would enhance the manuscript's regional context. Supplementary References: For the discussion on methodologies (e.g., CMIP6), including references that detail the statistical downscaling process or similar regional studies would be helpful. <p>Suggested Additional References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent IPCC AR6 Working Group Reports (2021) for updated climate projections. Articles from journals like <i>Climatic Change</i> or <i>Forest Ecology and Management</i> focusing on forest resilience and adaptation in Latin America. Regional climate studies published by Mexican or Latin American environmental research organizations. 	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript is written in generally clear English, but there are several areas where the language could be improved for better readability and professionalism:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar and Sentence Structure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some sentences are overly long and complex, which makes them harder to follow. For example, in the introduction, phrases like "Due to the close relationship between forest ecosystems and humans, it is important to develop mitigation and adaptation policies..." could be split into shorter sentences for clarity. Minor grammatical errors, such as subject-verb agreement and article usage, need correction (e.g., "climatic variations that affect forest ecosystems, making them vulnerable" instead of "climatic variations that affects"). Technical Terms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The technical terminology is appropriate, but the definitions of indices such as SPEI and NDVI could be simplified slightly for broader accessibility. Flow and Transitions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitions between sections, particularly between results and discussion, could be smoother to enhance logical flow. Consistency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure consistent use of terms throughout the manuscript (e.g., "SPEI12" vs. "SPEI 12"). <p>Recommendation: Consider a thorough language edit or proofreading by a native English speaker with expertise in academic writing. This will ensure the manuscript meets the standards of scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>Behnoush Farokhzadeh</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Malayer University, Iran</p>