Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_123409**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Exploring the physical chemical parameters of Dal Lake, Kashmir, India: A research study**
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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**This research is highly significant for the scientific community. By examining the lake's water quality and ecological balance, it provides valuable contributions to freshwater management and conservation efforts both locally and globally. In this study, a detailed examination of various physical and chemical parameters has been conducted, showcasing a solid foundation in environmental analysis. However, to further strengthen the work, it is crucial to place a greater emphasis on the standard limits associated with these parameters. This includes not only defining what these limits are but also explaining the scientific reasoning behind them and the environmental regulations that establish these thresholds. For each parameter analyzed—such as temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen, and particularly biological nutrients like ammoniacal nitrogen, nitrate nitrogen, and nitrite nitrogen—there should be a detailed discussion on what these parameters indicate about water quality. Moreover, the study should elaborate on the potential adverse effects on the ecosystem and human health if these parameters exceed the established standard limits. For example, elevated levels of ammoniacal nitrogen can lead to toxicity in aquatic life, while excessive nitrate and nitrite nitrogen can cause eutrophication, leading to harmful algal blooms and oxygen depletion. Additionally, providing case studies or examples where exceeding these limits has led to significant environmental consequences could offer a practical perspective. This would not only enhance the depth of the analysis but also underscore the real-world relevance of maintaining these standards.** **Overall, while the work is commendable in its current form, incorporating these additional elements would enrich the study, making it a more comprehensive and impactful contribution to the field of environmental science.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**Yes**	
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.	**Yes, enhance it by including points on which parameters are experiencing significant fluctuations and discussing the seasonal effects on these parameters.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes, expand the Materials and Methods section to include details related to the experimental analysis, such as specifying the methods selected from APHA and citing APHA. Additionally, include the model of any instruments used for the analysis, like the UV-Vis spectrophotometer.**	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its thorough examination of various physical and chemical parameters in water quality assessment. By detailing the significance of parameters such as pH, temperature, optical parameters, conductivity, phosphate, ammoniacal nitrogen, nitrate nitrogen, and nitrite nitrogen, etc., the study provides valuable insights into their roles in maintaining ecological balance. Although it does not explicitly discuss standard limits, its comprehensive approach to parameter analysis and the potential adverse effects of deviations highlights the study's reliability and relevance to water quality management. This approach ensures that the research is both methodologically rigorous and practically useful.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	**Yes**	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The English language is good and readable	
Optional/General comments	Overall work is written well and good	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Shameem K S**
Department, University & Country	**VIT University, India**