

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101830
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF SOILS FROM DIFFERENT BLOCKS OF PALAKKAD DISTRICT OF KERALA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1-This article is important for the scientific community and knowledge about the evolution of soils. The authors analysed the physical properties of soils of different villages in Palakkad District of Kerala. The achieved allowed to infer that these soils have good water retaining capacity and physical condition and are suitable for agriculture. The manuscript is clear and detailed, the conclusions are in accordance with results, therefore, it can be considered for publication if the revision described below in the Optional/General comments is included in the manuscript.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3- The abstract should be improved in order to include the position where the samples were collected.</p> <p>4- The subsections are appropriated.</p> <p>5- The manuscript is scientifically correct but needs to be improved.</p> <p>6- The references are relevant and adequate.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1- The manuscript needs of to be read carefully again and some typos should be correctec.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please avoid capital letters of normal words in the middle of the text. See for example "Different " in the first line 2.2 section. Please verify all the document. - Why the second sentence of 2.3 section starts with"? - Please verify the English because some verbs are not concordant. - Why mean values for bulk density and particle density for each village were not calculated and presented in Table 1? Please indicate in the table caption the meaning of V1, V2, V3, V4,...which I think are related with depth where the sample was collected. - Figure 1 should be most interesting if these mean values of bulk density and particle density are plotted as a function of depth. This means that for each village and physical quantity, a curve is achieved. Similar suggestion is also for Figure 2. - Why were these values not also plotted as a function of village altitude or slope of the ground of the local were the samples are collected. - The position where the samples were collected, namely, geographic coordinates, altitude and slope of the ground should be indicated in the paper and in the summary. 	

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:	Maria Raposo
Department, University & Country	NOVA School of Science and Technology, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Portugal