

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_96349</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A REVIEW ON RECENT ADVANCES IN AGRICULTURE AND AGROFORESTRY WITH GPS AND GIS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Mini-review Article</b>

### 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</b> REVISION 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. <b>Yes, it is. The manuscript emphasizes very well where are used GIS and GPS in agriculture and agroforestry, sensitive domains where these tools bring important benefits.</b>  2. <b>Some papers from references are from 1997, 1998. From this point of view, the word "recent" from title is not looking appropriate. I would cut that word.</b>  3. <b>The abstract is comprehensive.</b>  4. <b>Yes, the structure of this paper is good</b>  5. <b>I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct.</b>  6. <b>From my point of view the number of papers that are presented is not enough for a review. They should dig more.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. Yes, it is.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Mihaela Tinca Udristioiu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Craiova, Romania</b>