

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97395
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of Advanced Techniques to Predict the Soil Properties
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This research discusses the prediction of soil pH distribution using kriging techniques by comparing ordinary kriging (OK) and universal kriging (UK) techniques. This research is actually about the geostatistics method that has been widely applied. 2. The title remains the same because the use of the phrase Spatial Statistics or Geostatistical Method has been widely used for other research titles. 3. Abstract in this research is quite adequate. 4. In a simple journal format, that's enough. 5. The manuscript is about geostatistical methods by comparing ordinary kriging and universal kriging techniques. 6. With a simple discussion, namely comparing OK and UK, I think the references used are sufficient, even though I actually proposed at least 25 references 	

Review Form 1.7

<p>please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The author must improve the quality of English grammar	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract in this research is quite adequate. Why do you write citations in the form of [8], but in other parts you write the name and year, for example (Gia Pham T. et al., 2019)? Be consistent. Provide a description of the notations/images on the map in Legend. Please explain what variogram model is used in this Figure 3.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Waterman Sulistyana Bargawa
Department, University & Country	UPN Veteran Yogyakarta, Indonesia