

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_128463
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF COMBINED APPLICATIONS OF LIMING MATERIALS AND CO-COMPOSTED BIOCHAR ON SUBSOIL ACIDITY AND ALUMINIUM TOXICITY IN THE SOUTHERN LATERITE SOILS OF KERALA
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript is important but lacks important sections such as discussion of results. Abstract should be without any topics. Some methodology needs to be explained with appropriate procedures	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Too long , suggested a short one in the manuscript, should be concise and descriptive also <b>APPLICATIONS OF LIME AND CO-COMPOSTED BIOCHAR ON ACIDITY AND ALUMINIUM TOXICITY IN LATERITE SOILS OF KERALA</b>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Comprehensive but needs rewriting and clarifying abbreviations. Should not be any topics and one or two paragraphs maximum	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Fairly ok. Cannot comment without the discussion section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient but old. Author says there are many research work for past several decades, so he should be able to quote references in the recent past research.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Should be rewritten including a section of discussion and some areas of methodology which are missing. It is also suggested to do a more advance statistical analysis (DMRT) and upgrade all the tables.	

Commented [n1]: n1

#### 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:	N. Senanayake
Department, University & Country	Rajarata University of Sri lanka, Sri lanka