

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_86450
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate Change Resilience and Adaptation Strategies in Ecologically Fragile Urban Mining Communities: A Review of Existing Research and Practice
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)												
Compulsory REVISION comments														
Minor REVISION comments	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Introduction:</td> <td>In this section, the importance of the study has been clearly described. Also, convenient literatures have been specified.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Methodology:</td> <td>An effective methodology has been used and clarified adequately.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Results:</td> <td>In the result section, an effective way has been used.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Discussion:</td> <td>In this section together with Results, the findings have been correlated with the literature, effectively.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bibliography/References:</td> <td>There is no problem in Reference section.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Decision:</td> <td>There are some small writing mistakes. The manuscript should be re-read by the author, correct these mistakes. Manuscript can be accepted for publication after minor corrections.</td> </tr> </table>	Introduction:	In this section, the importance of the study has been clearly described. Also, convenient literatures have been specified.	Methodology:	An effective methodology has been used and clarified adequately.	Results:	In the result section, an effective way has been used.	Discussion:	In this section together with Results, the findings have been correlated with the literature, effectively.	Bibliography/References:	There is no problem in Reference section.	Decision:	There are some small writing mistakes. The manuscript should be re-read by the author, correct these mistakes. Manuscript can be accepted for publication after minor corrections.	
Introduction:	In this section, the importance of the study has been clearly described. Also, convenient literatures have been specified.													
Methodology:	An effective methodology has been used and clarified adequately.													
Results:	In the result section, an effective way has been used.													
Discussion:	In this section together with Results, the findings have been correlated with the literature, effectively.													
Bibliography/References:	There is no problem in Reference section.													
Decision:	There are some small writing mistakes. The manuscript should be re-read by the author, correct these mistakes. Manuscript can be accepted for publication after minor corrections.													
Optional/General comments	As a general evaluation, manuscript contain valuable results and findings for plant sciences studies in the future.													

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:	M. Nuri Öner
Department, University & Country	Çankırı Karatekin University, Turkey