

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96517
Title of the Manuscript:	Phosphorus fractionation in sediment and agricultural soils surrounding the Lake Toho (southern Benin) in rainy season
Type of the 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 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Importance: The authors aimed to assess the mobility and bioavailability of phosphorus in cultivated lands around lake Toho, in the Republic of Benin to evaluate the extent of the contamination caused by anthropogenic activity. Title: Clear, concise, and informative. Some modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding. Abstract: Clear to a certain extent. Some abbreviations were used that have to be illustrated in full names at their first appearance. Some modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding. Structure of the manuscript: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Keywords: Please rearrange in alphabetical order. Introduction: Improperly arranged in six paragraphs. Preferred to rearrange the introduction into three paragraphs only i.e., 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding. The aim: Clear and informative. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding. Materials and methods: Please notice the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No ethical approval number and considerations were provided. The authors did not provide the statistical analysis section with a reference and the statistical model used. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Results: The results are novel and clear to a greater extent. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Discussion: Clear to a greater extent, informative, and contribute to knowledge with good comparison and speculation. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Conclusion: Clear and informative. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding. Figures: Well-presented and organized. Scientific Soundness: The manuscript presented a novel and important idea with a moderate language expression that requires a little bit of improvement to enhance readability and understanding. <p>References: MUST BE UPDATED as 28.5% (8 out of 28) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to increase to 30-40%. The old reference indicates less interest in the study field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>General view: The manuscript was written in moderate English and grammar. Copyediting and proofreading have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value and enhance the importance of the study.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Essam Samir Soliman
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt