

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_128502
Title of the Manuscript:	Addressing Urban Heat Islands through Green Building Strategies: A Literature Review
Type of the Article	Review 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: 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 manuscript addresses a critical topic for the scientific and urban planning community. It highlights the role of green buildings (GBs) in mitigating the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect, which is essential for combating climate change. The thorough literature review provides useful insights and identifies key strategies, such as green roofs and green infrastructure. It is valuable for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners in urban development and climate resilience.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate but can be refined for better clarity. Suggested title: "Mitigating Urban Heat Islands: The Role of Green Building Strategies –	
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 effectively outlines the scope of the study but can be more concise. Key terms such as "PRISMA guidelines" and specific findings (e.g., impact of green roofs) should be briefly mentioned to provide a clearer summary. Avoid redundancy, as terms like "urban heat" appear repetitively.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and based on reliable sources. The use of PRISMA methodology strengthens its credibility. However, more specific examples or data from developing countries could enhance the global applicability of findings. Including quantitative comparisons of UHI reduction by different GB strategies would add depth.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are extensive and cover a wide range of sources. However, a few are dated (e.g., from 2001). Including more recent studies (2020–2024) would strengthen the review. Consider adding regional studies from Asia or Africa to provide a balanced perspective.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication but requires minor improvements. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplify complex sentences for clarity. • Reduce repetitive phrases, especially in sections like "Urban Heat" and "Conclusion." • Improve transitions between ideas for better readability. 	
Optional/General comments	Adding visual aids such as graphs or comparative tables showing the effectiveness of different GB strategies would make the manuscript more engaging and informative. The discussion on barriers to GB adoption could include potential policy recommendations to encourage implementation.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Theingi Aung
Department, University & Country	Mullion Façade Engineering School, Myanmar