



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	The authors aimed to characterize and classify soils using remote sensing and GIS techniques, but do not present the parameters of these techniques (remote sensing and GIS techniques); do not present the methodology used to make the characterization and classification of the soils of the basin through the tools mentioned. Various chemical, physical and physico-chemical data are presented, on the other hand these data are widely discussed world-wide, evidencing that the work, in this format, does not offer any scientific novelty.	
Minor REVISION comments	The title suggests that the authors will use geostatistical techniques, based on the theory of regionalized variables, using semivariogram and all the geostatistical basis, but this is not the case. Bibliographical references, for the most part, are outdated, which may have led the authors along the path they followed.	
Optional/General comments	In this sense, I recommend that the authors evaluate the objectives of the work in consonance with the title, the hypotheses, justifications and mainly the methodology.	

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:	Diony Alves Reis
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Western Bahia, Brazil