

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104543
Title of the Manuscript:	SUBSOIL ACIDITY AMELIORATION FOR IMPROVED SOIL PRODUCTIVITY
Type of the Article	Review 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>The article presents very interesting study about subsoil acidity amelioration for improved soil productivity. The reviewer has read carefully the article and concluded that, the title of the article is suitable and the abstract of the article is comprehensive. The manuscript shows much information about topic and it reflects very well the aim and scope of this paper.</p> <p>The article is well written, but I suggest minor revisions of the article so that the manuscript important for scientific community.</p> <p>Comments for the authors: I have following observations: The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, please add the number (5) to the conclusion; The article is composed only of theory; it has no tables or graphs and statistical data. It is necessary to consider whether to supplement the text with important data - Tables (examples of the concentration of elements, such as calcium, aluminium, etc. and compare areas with high values with low values of elements) All the references cited of paper are relevant and adequate. English quality of the article is good and suitable for scholarly communications.</p> <p>The reviewer recommends publication after these minor revisions and suggests accept the paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Oľga Šestinová
Department, University & Country	Institute of Geotechnics, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Slovakia