

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103289
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of pedo-transfer functions for estimating soil erodibility and soil aggregate stability from basic soil properties in submontane area using statistical methods and machine learning techniques for Northern India land
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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>No – title should be crystal clear within 15 words</p> <p>No – Abstract should be clear and within 150 words. Too lengthy and more know facts</p> <p>No – Methods are described, however, you do not clarify how you will carry out your suggested task. Just like you would after gathering data, describe each action you took to get your results.</p> <p>No</p> <p>No – only 1 paper cited in 2021. References should be relevant, don't just add to increase numbers and add recent references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In-depth work has been done, but not presented properly.</p> <p>Defining and explaining well-known phrases should be avoided.</p> <p>Equation numbers in equations are missing.</p> <p>Figures and tables explanation are missing, like why those numbers etc?</p>	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vasudha M P
Department, University & Country	K&S Partners, India