

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_127179
Title of the Manuscript:	Prioritization of sub-watersheds vulnerable to soil erosion in Karjan river basin
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Few common factors are lack of structure and focus, scanty literature review, unclear justification to the statements, unsubstantiated results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is suitable, however has scope for modification. But the Text needs through revision to go with the title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract lacks clarity and coherence regarding the primary focus of sub-watershed prioritization for soil erosion. The title suggests that the study revolves around sub-watershed prioritization for soil erosion, but the abstract only hints at this towards the end, which dilutes the focus and may confuse readers.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not appropriate, strong restructuring shall benefit the manuscript.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript under review shows significant gaps in several areas that need addressing to enhance its quality and relevance. Firstly, there is a lack of a comprehensive literature review, which limits the depth of understanding in the context of previous work and leaves readers without a clear perspective on how this study builds on existing research. This section should include recent studies related to watershed prioritization, soil erosion parameters, and morphometric analysis to provide a robust scientific foundation for the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	No more references are needed. There a lot of papers with similar themes on internet, only advise is to refer papers in journals published by international publishers.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript under review shows significant gaps in several areas that need addressing to enhance its quality and relevance. Firstly, there is a lack of a comprehensive literature review, which limits the depth of understanding in the context of previous work and leaves readers without a clear perspective on how this study builds on existing research. This section should include recent studies related to watershed prioritization, soil erosion parameters, and morphometric analysis to provide a robust scientific foundation for the study.</p> <p>The manuscript would also benefit greatly from thorough restructuring, particularly in how the results are presented in relation to the paper's objectives. The results section currently lacks clarity and does not convincingly support the stated goals of watershed prioritization for soil erosion, making it difficult for readers to follow the analysis.</p> <p>Furthermore, the parameters used in the study require re-evaluation and rigorous verification, ideally against established standards or benchmarks within the field. This would ensure that the analysis accurately reflects the impact of these parameters on soil erosion and watershed prioritization. A more careful validation of the data and a deeper integration of cited sources would improve the credibility and precision of the findings.</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:	Chinmay Uday Dongare
Department, University & Country	The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, India