

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_110882
Title of the Manuscript:	Resilience Engineering on Climate Change in Environment
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1. YES 2. YES 3. NO: The abstract is not well structured. 4. YES 5. YES: The study seeks to present and discuss assessments of resilience engineering, focusing on its role as a framework for addressing environmental issues that impact livelihoods. These issues include resilience and management related to water, soil, food, flood-drought, and public infrastructure. While the topic is crucial, there is a need for improved coherence with supportive literature. For instance: -First sentence of Introduction: When the authors say: “According to the dictionary resilience means "the ability to recover from difficulties or disturbance." (which dictionary??), -“Some scholars argue that resilience and sustainability tactics target different goals”. (which ones??). The authors should support their affirmations by appropriate references. - For the Equations, the authors should mention the meaning of R _L , R... abbreviations 6. NO: Some sentences are vague and deserve to be supported by appropriate references.	 3. The abstract has also been updated and strengthened. 5. The textual content has been revised and strengthened. The content of cited documents has also been reorganized.The definitions of symbols in the equations are also added. Relevant corrections are marked with a yellow colourbackground for easy reference and verification. 6.The description of cited documents has been revised to make itclear.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 The manuscript suffers from poor English and lack of novelty. Many affirmations in the text need to be supported by references.	 Appropriate corrections and enhancements have been made to the grammatical aspects.
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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. All references have sources listed.