

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_111146
Title of the Manuscript:	India's G20 Meeting's Stand on Environment and Climate Change Adaptation
Type of the Article	Conceptual

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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Very important. Adjust the Title to make it a Researchable Topic The abstract is not comprehensive as it lacks an objective, methodology, findings, contribution to knowledge and recommendations The sub-sections are appropriate Scientifically correct Well updated References	1) Changed the title as per the instructions of the reviewer 2) Modified abstract as per the instructions of the reviewer 3) Modified grammatical errors as per the instructions of the reviewer
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some grammatical checks are needed	
Optional/General comments	1. The paper has not cohesive objective. 2. The did not establish any "research gap" for his study. 3. The paper lacks critical analytical review. The author is completely absent in his work. The work is more of a presentation or summary of the G20 meetings. The author should embark on the evaluation of the future prospects of the "Decisions Taken".	The article modified as per the instructs of the reviewer

[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>	