

www.sciencedomain.org

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	- The absence of references in the introduction;	
	- Better expose the objectives and the hypotheses of the study;	
	- $15 ^{\circ}$ c and $30 ^{\circ}$ 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;	

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

- Studied area or study area?
 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

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
MINOT REVISION comments	- 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. 	
	Plagiarism issue: References are necessary in the introduction of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	- 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; 	

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

- 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 improved.	
- 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?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Victor Wilson Botteon
Department, University & Country	Center for Nuclear Energy in Agriculture, University of São Paulo, Brazil