

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_98554
Title of the Manuscript:	UNSUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES AS A DRIVER OF SOIL DEGRADATION IN SANTA SUB-DIVISION, NORTH WEST REGION OF CAMEROON
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.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	This draft is a well-structured one benefiting from smooth writing. Throughout the text efforts have been made to convey the essence of the study to the reader. Moreover, each section of the draft starts with an outline of the things to come and ends with a glimpse of what is going to happen in the coming section. The succession of the sections is well selected. Yes, title suits to article. Yes Yes Yes, it is correct. No, they have done the literature very well and in an organized manner. No comments, I recommend accepting this manuscript without any revision.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is good.	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amit Kumar Pandey
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Technology, India