Journal Name:	**Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JGEESI_126403**
Title of the Manuscript:	
	Empirical and Machine Learning Models for Soil Erosion Risk Assessment: A case Study of Tsageri Municipality, Georgia
Type of the Article	

<u>General guidelines for the Peer Review process:</u>

This journal's peer review policy states that **<u>NO</u>** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**<u>lack of Novelty'</u>**, 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/

<u>Important Policies Regarding Peer Review</u>

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

Review Form 3

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	Manuscript is not that much contributing to the scientific community it only describes the fundamental studies Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative 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.	Abstract is not properly drafted rather it is very superficial. Only fundamental study of RUSLE is considered which is covered most of the available literature.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate but in figure no latitude and longitudes are shown, include that. Increase font for the legends of the figures, specifically figure 4.	
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.	**Manuscript is not scientifically robust and need major revisions by considering latest developments of RUSLE.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Very poor quality of literature referred, and citations are also not sufficiently addressed. References are not sufficient and not that much recent. Include recent literature.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General 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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Suraj Kalgonda Patil**
Department, University & Country	**DKTES Textile & Engineering Institute, India**