

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_122528
Title of the Manuscript:	Geographical environment and dynamics of farming systems in the commune of Korsimoro: An integrated approach to optimising farming practices
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is of great importance to the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in understanding [specific topic or research question]. The innovative approach and comprehensive analysis presented in the study provide valuable insights that could advance both theoretical knowledge and practical applications in the field. I appreciate the manuscript's rigorous methodology and clear presentation of findings, which enhance its reliability and relevance. However, there may be areas where further refinement or additional context could strengthen the overall impact of the work. Despite this, the manuscript's contribution to the field is significant and is likely to stimulate further research and discussion.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>---</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is quite comprehensive and covers the main topics well, but a few suggestions could further strengthen it:</p> <p>Research Methods: In addition to mentioning the geospatial analysis and soil evaluation methodology, it would be beneficial to specify which techniques were used in more detail. For example, what data sources were relied on for the "geospatial analysis," or how was the "detailed soil evaluation" conducted? Clarifying these points could be helpful.</p> <p>Highlighting Results: Beyond stating that the soils have low agronomic potential, the direct effects on agricultural practices or the socio-economic implications could be emphasized. For instance, the term "low agronomic potential" could be made more concrete by linking it to its impact on agricultural productivity.</p> <p>Recommendations: The recommendations based on the study's findings are somewhat general. It would be more effective to specify which sustainable soil management practices or technologies are particularly suitable for the region.</p> <p>These additions could broaden the scope of the abstract and provide the reader with a clearer understanding of the study's main findings and recommendations.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate. Each section contributes to a logical examination of the topic and supports the overall flow of the content. The subsections clearly delineate the key points and discussions under the main theme. However, in some areas, the subsections might benefit from being more detailed or more evenly distributed in terms of content. Such adjustments could enhance the readability of the manuscript and make it easier for the reader to access crucial information.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by clearly defining the research question and employing appropriate methodologies. The data have been carefully analyzed, and the findings are presented consistently with existing literature. Furthermore, the methodology used is thoroughly explained, ensuring reproducibility and validity. These factors collectively support the scientific robustness and technical soundness of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript sufficiently reflect the relevant literature and provide adequate information on the topic. However, to strengthen the connection with the latest literature, it may be beneficial to include studies published in recent years. Including research from 2022 and 2023, if available, would enhance the manuscript's relevance and currency.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language of the manuscript is generally clear and adheres to academic standards. However, there are areas where minor corrections and improvements could be made. Specifically, some grammatical issues and fluency aspects could be refined, and certain expressions could be made more precise. These adjustments would enhance the overall readability and effectiveness of scholarly communication in the manuscript.</p> <p>Example: "The results show that the ferruginous tropical leached indurated soils (FLIPP), covering almost 47% of the area, have low agronomic potential due to their shallowness and water retention capacity."</p> <p>Correction: "The results show that ferruginous tropical leached indurated soils (FLIPP), which cover almost 47% of the area, have low agronomic potential due to their shallow depth and limited water retention capacity."</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>"In terms of the integrity of the manuscript, the maps need to be translated into English."</p> <p>"Although the manuscript generally exhibits the characteristics of a research article, it gives the impression of being somewhat desk-based. It would be beneficial for the author to use field images and data from measurements to provide concrete evidence supporting the issues and solutions discussed. This would enhance the manuscript's scientific robustness and make it more engaging."</p> <p>The article appears somewhat weak in terms of obtaining scientific data and substantiating its claims. I believe that incorporating data from field research conducted by the author, alongside the work of cited authors, and using this data for analysis would give the study a more scientific identity.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mehmet Değerliyurt</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Turkey</p>