

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_99066
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil Analytics: Inter-conversion of units among different parameters in soil science
Type of the Article	Opinion 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)
<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>	The article is important for scientific community. Because agriculturalist or those who run agro-business will find this article to be very useful.  Yes.  Yes. Except that the article abstract supposed to provide a brief or an overview of the entire article at a glance.  Yes.  Yes.  More reference/literatures will be needed to make the article richer.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is okay; however, it need more literature work.	

### 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:	Solomon Gausa
Department, University & Country	Modibbo Adama University, Nigeria