

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_92086</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Climate disruption, high humidity, and reduced cloud formation, caused by the degradation of the Ocean surface biofilm micro-layer due to plankton toxicity from lipophilic chemicals, microplastic and black carbon soot.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Commentary</b>

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This study was trying to point out the layer formation on seawater due to discharged and living organisms called as surface microlayer. These kinds of studies are needed to be conducted for the understanding of the distribution this surface microlayer to understand and make solution to avoid this formation to reduce the impact of these things.</p> <p>The topic of the study is a topic of relevance and general interest to the readers of the journal. However, I felt that the paper is not an overall well in approach including the arrangement. However, On the other hand, I found the writing style of this manuscript is well written but still I would recommend checking the manuscript with a native speaker and making the spelling mistakes. In addition, I noticed the arrangement of the study in a good manner while the description of some very important points was inadequate or completely missing.</p> <p>Further, I have little confidence in some important analyses and came away with many questions to be able to recommend this paper for publication as it stands. Therefore, I recommend a Major revision of this manuscript. I explain my concerns in more detail below. I ask that the authors specifically address each of my comments in their responses.</p> <p>Major comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I am satisfied about the introduction. The introduction part of the manuscript is good manner and provided useful information to support it.</li> <li>2. The approach of his review paper should be more scientific manner and arrange things properly as I mentioned in the comment on the manuscript. Please try to make the subtopic very scientific manner and maintain the flow properly. The flow of the manuscript is not good enough for publication.</li> <li>3. In the abstract and conclusion, the abstract and conclusion should be revised properly. Please rewrite both the abstract and conclusion according to the proper format.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minor comments and suggestions are provided with the manuscript.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please recheck the authors guidelines provided by journal and try to rearrange whole manuscript according to the suggestions provided including the reference.	

**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:	H. K. S. De Zoysa
Department, University & Country	Rajarata University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka.