

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_95078
Title of the Manuscript:	Saving and Storing Data through Mobile-based Applications Dedicated to Soil Protection
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:

(<https://www.journalasrj.com/index.php/ASRJ/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important</p> <p>The article is fit for purpose</p> <p>The abstract is sufficiently comprehensive</p> <p>The manuscript follows a good structure</p> <p>I am not able to judge the scientific correctness of the manuscript</p> <p>The references seem to be adequate</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of language use is good.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest the following:</p> <p>a) In the introduction, the author should include a statement of purpose and scope</p> <p>b) In the section for materials and method, readability would be enhanced by creating the following subsections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research questions • Description of research method • Procedure • Materials <p>c) Some of the figures need to be made more readable, e.g. Figures 2, 3, 5, 6</p> <p>d) The conclusion should include a comparison of the results and what previous studies found. This will add to the justification of the value added by this study to the body of knowledge</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph Mukuni
Department, University & Country	Virginia Tech, USA