SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_64659**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Aerosol Black Carbon measurement at High altitude Western Ghats location of Ooty, Tami Nadu**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	Overall, the entire paper needs strong revision. It lacks important and strong references, methods and discussion. The authors need to check most of the information throughout the text, there are some awry sentences. For this paper to be accepted, it requires major revision, more details about the methods used and more scientific discussion.	Ok sir. Thank you
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: Abstract needs more information. It is confusing and requires more scientific revision. Introduction: 1st paragraph: Aerosols have more than one size, it depends on the particle type and its suspension. You cannot say that they are tiny. Vide Seinfeld and Pandis as reference. When you say: "*For example, sulphate aerosols scatters the solar radiation results in negative radiative forcing responsible for cooling of Earth, whereas BC has efficient light absorbing characteristics, that leads to warming effect*" You need to specify this. The way you mentioned is not completely right. Yes, they have these proprieties but in the liquid effect. The whole paragraph needs to be revised. There are plenty of information that requires more scientific reference. You make affirmations that are not completely right. Please review your entire paragraph. 2nd paragraph: When you say: "*Another study, Kompalli et al. (2018) confirms the highest concentration of BC during summer attributed to winds mainly from south and south directions and found the possibilities of ex-situ particles and gaseous species in the study site. Based on the prelude, current study was taken up to understand the daily, monthly and seasonal variability in the study site.*" This entire paragraph needs to be revised. There are several papers that study BC aerosols throughout the world. Please look at them with attention. Also, revise your scientific written. Topic 2.3: There is no need to inform the format of your files, nor what software you used to generate your results. Discussion and results: Your entire results section needs discussion and revision. There are several sentences that require reference as well as scientific discussion. Topic 4.2: the entire paragraph needs revision. Topic 4.3: Did you separate BC aerosols, or you just compared AOD with mass concentration? Did you convert AOD into mass concentration to make this comparison? How do you know that enhancement of AOD is related to BC aerosols?	Yes sir. Thank you for your valuable comments

	Please pay attention on your sentences, most of them are confusing.	
Optional/General comments	English needs to be strongly revised.	Ok sir

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)*	No sir