



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_43366
Title of the Manuscript:	Land resources inventory of Central Dry Agro-climatic Zone of Karnataka- A case study from in Gollarahatti-2 micro-watershed employing geo-spatial techniques
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>Title: the title should be changed.(Soil characterization and classification of Gllarahatti-2 watershed ,Karnataka, India)</p> <p>Abstract: the abstract should be improved by having introduction and objective sentences.</p> <p>The benefit or purpose of this study need tobe justified clearly here and in the introduction section.</p> <p>Line 10:too long sentence and make two sentence.</p> <p>Line 14-15: it is not clear and consistence so re write it for clarity purpose.</p> <p>Line 16: "low to medium" what was the measurement for this.</p> <p>Line 20: where is the conclusion for suitability and capability of the land as it was mentioned above in the introduction.</p> <p>Country of the study area should be clearly mentioned in the abstract.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Line 28-30:43-45: the sentence is long and disconnected for the reader.</p> <p>The whole paragraph in this page has no references. How did you confirm what you write is correct and scientifically acceptable by others.</p> <p>Line 33...self sufficiency and food security could be improved by food self sufficiency...</p> <p>Line 47: the best way to solve.... Where is your reference?</p> <p>Line 52-56: very long and disconnected sentence.</p> <p>Line 58: delete ...representing central dry zone of...and write the name of the country for the readers.</p> <p>Line 60:deleteusing remote sensing and GIS techniques. There is no GIS technique used in the study.</p> <p>Line 65: what is "Ragi" for the reader?</p> <p>Line 66 what is red soils...is this proper term to identify soil in soil sciences?</p> <p>Line 69 MSL abbreviation?</p> <p>Line 70: Neem, Pongamia...put it by scientific names</p> <p>Line 71-85: this is purely methods so please separate under new section called methods. The site description should be stated in the clear format by having map. Data collection and analysis method is purely stated or omitted so please include in strong manner.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title has been changed according to suggestion 2. Abstract was upgraded with introduction and objective 3. The rating of soil properties were indicated as what is low, medium etc 4. The main objective of the paper is only about characterization and classification, not about the land capability and suitability. So they have not been mentioned. But mentioned as these are the outcomes of Land resource inventory 5. Typographical and vocabulary corrections were made according to suggestions given by reviewer 6. Scientific names as well as local name also given for the crops 7. The title of the chapter materials and methods were changed as Methods 8. The place of study was mentioned correctly 9. The base map for this study was prepared with the help of geo spatial techniques (digitization, overlaying of toposheets on satellite images, etc.) 10.Vikas NK, 2016 reference which was missing inside the text is added. 11.Other references Challa mentioned in line no: 182 12.Satyanarayana mentioned in line no:148 13.Singh and Agarwal, 2005 was mentioned in line no:144



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 71-75: it is not clear the use of this method in this study and the result does not indicate it so please delete the section.</p> <p>Result and discussion Line 117: what is....result of the....? The justification and discussion given here is poor so kindly improve by strong scientific evidences and references. Line 120: Table should be inserted here or above Line 138-141: very long sentence so make it short sentences.</p> <p>Line 146: Table should be inserted here or above</p> <p>Line 152-155: very long and disconnected sentence. Line 159: insert in betweenare line... Line 165-183: The justification and discussion given here is poor so kindly improve by strong scientific evidences and references. Line 188-210: there is no citation used so the justification and discussion given here is poor so kindly improves by strong scientific evidences and references.</p> <p>Conclusions Line 218: change unis to units The conclusion should be strengthen by recommendations</p> <p>Reference : The forllwing references were not cited in the main text. Challa O.... Satyanarayana T.... Singh IS..... Vikas Nk.....</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The grammar and punctuations should be checked.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has important information for the specific watershed. However, the importance for the wider reader outside the watershed it provides is very limited. Kindly make it more readable and important for the outsider.	

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>	