

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_129691
Title of the Manuscript:	Original Research Article Assessment of Erosion Index through Rainfall Data for Hisar Region, Haryana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The assessment of the erosion index through rainfall data is critical for understanding soil erosion patterns in the Hisar region, Haryana. This analysis helps in quantifying the potential of rainfall to cause soil detachment and transport, providing valuable insights for sustainable land and water resource management. For the scientific community, it offers a foundation for developing region-specific erosion control measures, improving agricultural productivity, and mitigating environmental degradation. Furthermore, such studies contribute to the global understanding of climate-induced erosion risks, enhancing predictive models and informing policy-making.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, it's better to say "Quantifying Soil Erosion Potential Using Rainfall Data: A Case Study of Hisar Region, Haryana"	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a good overview of the research question, methodology, results, and implications of the study. The abstract is also well-written and easy to read.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized and easy to follow. The subsections are logical and informative.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. However, The authors need to discuss the limitations of their study and suggest directions for future research.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No there is language problems for scientific community	
Optional/General comments	A good job, This manuscript has scientific relevance and mainly as a data generator for public management of study area. However, the following comments should be improved :- - update your references(you use old reference) - Better to add Methodological frame work. - Conclusions should be better presented and showing a summary of the result. - Generally, I propose a comparison more with other local and regional work to better value the work. My recommendation for acceptance of the manuscript with major revision.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	Samuel Erimyas Teshome
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	Debark University, Ethiopia