

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_130427
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of different soil types under cocoa, cashew and rubber fields in Center-West Region of Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the Article	Research (Original) Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	This research can be significant as it provides insights into the soil properties and fertility status under cocoa, cashew, and rubber cultivation in Côte d'Ivoire as discussed by authors in the manuscript. But the important aspect lies to make this work significant is the case of understanding these variations supports sustainable land management, enhances crop productivity, and informs strategies for improving soil health in agroforestry systems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Integrated Soil Characterization in Agroforestry Ecosystems of Cocoa, Cashew, and Rubber in Côte d'Ivoire	

Review Form 3

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.	<div>1. You need to change your whole abstract. The abstract is poorly written, the abstract, You cannot start the abstract by directly telling the aim of your conducted research, first you have to define the importance of the particular field in which you are doing your research, after that you have to be precise about the research gaps, what study gap you have analyse and then tell the significance of your conducted research, after that tell the objective of the research, and then suitable methodology, study area and at the end conclusive statement showing your research work can be helpful in the various ways.</div> <div>2. The abstract should or must be restricted to one solid paragraph defining the perspectives as mentioned above.</div> <div>3. The methodology must include the type of instrumentation too.</div>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<div>The manuscript seems to be poorly structured in various ways:</div> <div>1. The introduction of this manuscript is totally outdated or either in complete in all aspects, it must have to be technical work, you are not telling the story of the content, you must be realistic while mentioning the previous research work in the same field.</div> <div>2. The keywords are also not appropriate.</div> <div>3. The research references are old fashioned according to the research pattern and maybe not properly cited using EndNote or Mendeley.</div> <div>4. Study area cannot be the part of the materials and methods, and you have write in text about the study area but your research lacks the proper GIS map of the study area. (The research is totally incomplete without map of the research study area).</div> <div>5. There is a lot of amalgamation in your manuscript, you have mentioned the materials and methods but you have started describing some other content, and after that your heading start with 1.3, 1.4 and respectively.</div> <div>6. In result section, show all your analysis by the support of the graphical representation and the plot you have mention in your work again lacks the remediation and suitable strategies to your work.</div> <div>7. Your research work totally lacks the discussion part.</div>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent added, but lacks the proper sense of citation and formatting.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Seems to be ok. I must say considerable.	
Optional/General comments	No.	

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:	Talal Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Earthocity Research Innovation Centre, Pakistan