



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_27147
Title of the Manuscript:	Remote Sensing and GIS for Optimizing Land Use Base on Fertility Capability Classification
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>)



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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The absence of references in the introduction; - Better expose the objectives and the hypotheses of the study; - 15 °c and 30 °c or 6.5°to 24°C? Standard; - DEM abbreviation in “2.2.1.Remote Sensing data and processing” was not cited before; - Fertility capability classification in fig 2; - ENVI software (ver.4.8) reference in “2.2.1.Remote Sensing data and processing”; - The parentheses in: convexity) (2.2.2.Delineation of different landforms) - ArcGIS 9.3 software reference; - Figure 3 was not cited in the text; - Figure 4 reference is wrong; - “Particle size distribution (Piper, 1950)” and “calcareous soils(USSL Staff, 1954)” = reference cited divergent; - Figure 4 legend; - Studied area or study area? 	<p>References have been added to the introduction Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>DEM was cited in Abstract Done</p> <p>In fig.2 False colour composite Research Systems Inc., Boulder, CO, USA).</p> <p>Done Done</p> <p>Done Done Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>The legend is present Studied area</p> <p>The slope of WP11T is characterized as</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These soils are characterized by a high risk of soil erosion (SR) that erosion can negatively affect plant productivity and ecosystem functions – Reference? Little confused. - Table 5.a.Interpretation of Soil fertility capability classification units = the description is polluted; - Suggestive plausible soil management was not an objective of the present study; - The Conclusion seems the Abstract! - Conclusions should briefly state the major findings of the study; - Reference 8 is missing; - References formatting – see Authors Guideline 	<p>steep to very steep so the soils are characterized by a high risk of soil erosion (SR). Sorry, I didn't get what the reviewer mean</p> <p>Yes it is not objective of the study but it could be a good future research work in the future. I think no problem if some plausible soil managements were suggested. Done</p> <p>Done Done Done</p>
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The title should be without any abbreviations (Geographic Information System). - improved formatting in the Material and Methods and Results (words together and excess of space in some parts); - Defining the characteristics of each landform for the readers; - 2.2.4. Laboratory analysisand soil classification; - Table 5b = table 6? - Abbreviations without explanation for the readers (e.g. ESP). - 3.3.1.Low organic matter (m) and lownutrient reserves - “Suggestive plausible soil managements” and “Conclusion” need to be improved. <p>Plagiarism issue: References are necessary in the introduction of the manuscript.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>The formatting was done according to the template.</p> <p>I have described the detail characteristics of each landform in my published paper entitled GEOMATICS BASED SOIL MAPPING OF THE EASTERN DESERT PART OF SOHAG GOVERNORATE, EGYPT. I will attached it with reversed manuscript.</p> <p>Done Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The article is interesting and needs to be revised according to the suggestions. - In general, the article should have its readability improved for the readers and some abbreviation and tables need to be better explained; - The title seems to be a Review Paper and not an Original Research Article. Studied area cited in the title; - The introduction and discussion should have its readability 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Improve the second figure of the location map of the studied area (fig. 1).- See the use of abbreviations in keywords and figure legends.- How the soil profiles were selected?	<p>According to two criteria, the first is the DEM map and the second is the field observations.</p>
--	--	--