

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103744
Title of the Manuscript:	Identifying prominent environmental covariates using variable selection methodologies for digital soil mapping
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>)

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"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>I don't think it is important for the scientific community, because it lacks scientifically robust and technically sound, it needs major revision from the title to reference portions.</p> <p>No, I suggest to be Identification of main environmental parameters for digital soil mapping applications using variable selection method on the study area</p> <p>No, it needs rewriting, Grammarly checking and follows IMRAD (Introduction, Methodology, Result and Discussion) rules. It has lack of linkage among the ideas It looks good, with some minor revisions</p> <p>I don't think so, it lacks scientific way of writing manuscript</p> <p>They are sufficient but not recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No, they are not suitable and simple to understand and to communicate, it needs spelling, grammar, and English quality improvement for further revision</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Generally, the manuscript needs major revision according the given comments on the main body, and it needs simple way of communication. Please amend these comments given on the main manuscript for making the paper strong and readable by the scientific community. Use latest published articles for your manuscript and up to date references needed</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Esayas Meresa Weldamaryam
Department, University & Country	Tigray Agricultural Research Institute, Ethiopia