

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_126289
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization and Classification of Soils of Chamba Block of Tehri Garhwal District of Uttarakhand: A Case Study from Lesser Himalayas
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>
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.	This manuscript addresses a topic of great importance to the scientific community, focusing on the characterization and classification of soils in the Chamba region, a crucial area for natural resource management and sustainable agriculture. However, I am disappointed by the fact that the use of remote sensing, which could enrich the study, is not sufficiently utilized in the presented results. The absence of specific data or analyses derived from this method leaves a significant gap in the research, which could limit its impact and usefulness for other researchers in the field. Therefore, while the subject is relevant, the manuscript requires substantial improvements to meet the expected scientific standards.	Thanks for the nice comments. In this study, the remote sensing data has been used for soil survey purpose. On the basis of this data, some sites have been selected for soil sampling.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article, "Characterization and Classification of Soils of Chamba Block of Tehri Garhwal District of Uttarakhand: A Case Study from Lesser Himalayas," is suitable as it clearly indicates the subject of the study as well as the geographical context. However, to enhance its clarity and impact, I suggest a slight modification to make it more engaging. An alternative title could be: "Characterization and Classification of Soils in Chamba Block, Tehri Garhwal District: Insights from the Lesser Himalayas." This revision retains the original meaning while highlighting the insights gained through the research.	Thanks for suggesting the title. But according to me the original title is more suitable as per the content of the manuscript.
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 of the article presents the objectives, methodology, and results of the study but requires improvements. It lacks details about the specific results obtained regarding the classification and characterization of soils. Additionally, the absence of information on the use of remote sensing, which is an essential aspect of the research, weakens the abstract. It is recommended to add specifics about the types of soils identified and the implications of these results for land management in the region, as well as an explanation of the application of remote sensing. These additions would enhance the clarity and relevance of the abstract for readers.	The abstract has been modified as much as possible.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript follows a clear IMRAD structure (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion), which is appropriate for this type of study. However, some subsections could benefit from further clarification or reorganization to improve the flow of information. For example, the methodology section should explicitly separate the different techniques used, especially regarding remote sensing methods, as this is a critical element of the research. Additionally, the results section could be structured to more clearly differentiate the various types of soils and their specific characteristics. Overall, while the structure is generally solid, a few adjustments could enhance the coherence and readability of the manuscript.	Some sub-sections have been merged in 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 scientific rigor of this manuscript is compromised by the absence of statistical analyses and graphical representations such as diagrams and curves. While the authors provide relevant data on the characterization and classification of soils, it is essential to include quantitative analyses to support the results and strengthen the conclusions. The use of remote sensing in this study would also have benefited from adequate statistical analysis to demonstrate the validity of the data. In the absence of these elements, the manuscript lacks scientific and technical depth. Therefore, to improve the scientific robustness of the work, it is crucial to include statistical analyses and appropriate visualizations.	Thanks for the comments. In this manuscript, the field-based observation data and laboratory data have been presented very extensively, so graphs preparation will be the repetition, therefore the graphs were not prepared. It is also very difficult to define this kind of data by graphs. This study is limited to this particular block and has been done only for soil resource generation with its original data. Therefore, statistical analysis has not been included in the manuscript.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references cited in this manuscript are somewhat adequate; however, there is a need for more recent and relevant literature to support the findings. Some key studies in the field of soil characterization and remote sensing techniques seem to be missing, which would provide a broader context for the research. Including recent publications will enhance the manuscript's credibility and relevance within the scientific community. I recommend adding studies from the last five years that specifically address advancements in soil analysis methods and remote sensing applications.	Some of the latest references have been added in the manuscript.

Review Form 3

<div>Minor REVISION comments</div> <div>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</div>	<p>The quality of the language used in this article is generally adequate for scientific communication. The manuscript presents appropriate technical vocabulary and clear formulations, which facilitate the understanding of the concepts discussed. However, some passages could benefit from revision to improve the flow and coherence of the text. It would also be helpful to check grammar and spelling in certain sections to ensure that the article meets academic standards. Overall, with a few adjustments, the manuscript would be well-suited to the requirements of scientific publications.</p> <p>For example, "the first paragraph of the methodology section" could benefit from a revision to improve the flow and coherence of the text. Additionally, it would be useful to check grammar and spelling in sections such as [cite specific examples, e.g., "the abstract" or "the discussion"], as a few errors could undermine the manuscript's credibility.</p> <p>For instance: "the significant results" instead of "the significant result."</p> <p>Incorrect conjugations: (e.g., "it is important" instead of "they are important").</p> <p>Poorly structured propositions: e.g., "Although the results are encouraging, this shows that" should be clarified.</p> <p>Punctuation problems: e.g., "The extracts, results, and methods" instead of "The extracts results and methods."</p> <p>Clarify the subjects of sentences that may be ambiguous (e.g., "This can be observed" without specifying what "this" refers to).</p> <p>Misuse of tenses:</p> <p>Mixing tenses: Ensure that the tense used is appropriate for each section (e.g., the methods should be in the past tense, while the discussion can be in the present tense).</p>	<p>Thank you. The manuscript has been corrected accordingly.</p>
<div>Optional/General comments</div>	<p>In general, this manuscript addresses an important topic concerning the characterization and classification of soils in the Chamba Block of Tehri Garhwal District, Uttarakhand. The study has the potential to contribute valuable insights to the scientific community, particularly in the fields of soil science and environmental management. However, the manuscript requires significant improvements to meet publication standards.</p> <p>It is crucial to enhance the clarity and coherence of the text, particularly in sections where the methodology is discussed. The integration of remote sensing data should be better articulated to demonstrate its relevance to the results and conclusions drawn. Additionally, the manuscript would benefit from the inclusion of statistical analyses and graphical representations to support the findings presented.</p> <p>Furthermore, I encourage the authors to conduct a thorough review of the references to ensure they are current and comprehensive, as this will strengthen the credibility of the research. Addressing these points will significantly improve the manuscript's overall quality and its suitability for publication.</p>	<p>Thanks for the valuable comments. I tried and include as much as possible.</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No, there is not any ethical issue in this manuscript.