

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_97003</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>IMPACT OF LAND CAPABILITY CLASSES AND LAND USE ON PROPERRTIES AND ERODIBILITY BEHAVIOUR OF SOIL OF GHATAMPUR WATERSHED</b>
Type of the 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The manuscript in its present form is of very little importance, and can hardly be considered a scientific paper. No comprehensive discussion of the results included. Tables of results are included, but that is not very helpful without a proper discussion. 2. The title includes the impact on soil properties, whereas the objectives as outlined in the first paragraph of the introduction are related exclusively to the soil erodibility. Later on, however, in the second paragraph of the introduction, soil properties are referred to as part of the objectives of the study. No mention of soil properties is made in the conclusion section! Needless to say, the author/s ought to clearly state their objectives once and for all! 3. The abstract is rather long and parts of which should be part of the introduction. 4. More or less. 5. The manuscript is rather weak and ought to be re-written in a more scientifically-acceptable manner. 6. The references are OK.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Too many language errors, some of which are marked in red, need to be corrected. There are unnecessary repetitions, for ex. the sentences marked in red in page 2 of the manuscript. Even the title of the manuscript is repeated in the Materials and Methods section.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper lacks a literature survey section.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Hassan Al-Haj Ibrahim</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Baath University, Syria</b>