

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101126
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF SOIL FROM DIFFERENT BLOCKS OF KANDHMAL DISTRICT, ODISHA
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. Yes, it is important for scientific community as it presents the practical study on physico-chemical properties of soil from different blocks of Kandhmal district, Odisha.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. No, the abstract of the article is not comprehensive.</p> <p>4. No, subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is partially scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are correct, but are not sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality is very poor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. There is no review of literature associated with this study in the introduction section</p> <p>2. In Materials and Methods section, sampling itself means collection. So no need of writing 'and collection' in the sub-heading.</p> <p>3. Giving geographical location of Odisha is unnecessary.</p> <p>4. Put accurate degree symbol beside Celsius instead of making superscript of zero.</p> <p>5. Please elaborate methodology. It is very comprehensively written like abstract. Explain each method of analysis.</p> <p>6. Mention the company name of all instruments used in the analysis viz. Kjedaahl apparatus, Flame photometer, digital pH and electrical conductivity meter, etc.</p> <p>7. SI units are not properly mentioned everywhere in the whole manuscript. Specifically, in abstract portion, units are written wrongly in bracket.</p> <p>8. Which statistical analysis is used is not mentioned in the methods section.</p> <p>9. There is no footnote under any of the tables, stating any of the short forms viz. S.Em., C.D, etc.</p> <p>10. The major section i.e. Discussion part is missing.</p> <p>11. The references listed are not all cited in the manuscript.</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:	Sushree Sangeeta Dey
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Central Institute of Fisheries Education, India