

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99461
Title of the Manuscript:	Vertical variability of physical properties under different land - use practices in Vertisols and Inceptisols of Central India
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Abstract: -The concluding sentence of the abstract must highlight the relevance or contribution of this study to existing knowledge or industrial players briefly. Introduction: -Authors are advised to enrich the introduction by integrating some guiding ecological and sustainability concepts; research progress regarding what's done elsewhere and what is unknown but important to be studied that is driving the current study objectives must be made clear. -Again, the last paragraph must highlight the specific objectives or main aim of this study clearly, along with the necessity of this study. Conclusion: -Authors can consider integrating some study gaps or opportunities that could drive further studies. -Relevance or significance of this study's findings can be integrated in two or three sentences.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Other comments: -Some minor to moderate grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified in the manuscript. The manuscript is generally well-written.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has the needed ingredients to be considered for publication. It can explicitly enrich basic datasets regarding the scope of the subject in the study area. Authors should consider integrating some minor to moderate comments highlighted to improve the overall nature of the manuscript.	

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:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Research Institute for History of Science and Technology, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China