

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_126513
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Climatic and Oceanographic Parameters on CO2 Exchanges at the Air-Sea Interface in the Gulf of Guinea
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
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 MANUSCRIPT IS WELL STUDIED AND WRITTEN IN VERY SIMPLE AND LUCID WAY	OK
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	OK
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.	COMPARATIVELY GOOD BUT KEY WORDS CAN BE MORE ACCURATE	OK
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES	OK
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.	THE METHODOLOGY AND MATERIALS USED NEEDS TO BE IMPROVISED AS PER THE STUDY AREA.. DISCUSSION PART IS SHALLOW..REST IS OK	THE METHODOLOGY AND MATERIALS USED HAVE BEEN REVISED. WE BELIEVE IT HAS BEEN WELL PRESENTED, CONSIDERING OUR CONTRIBUTION IN RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK CONDUCTED ON THESE TOPICS.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES	OK
Minor REVISION comments	YES	OK
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	CAN BE PUBLISHED AS IT IS OR WITH LITTLE MODIFICATIONS	

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>	NO