



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_50120
Title of the Manuscript:	GIS-Based Analysis of Indigenous and Technical Knowledge of Soil Suitability Evaluation of Cocoa, Citrus and Oil Palm
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Please refer to the commented manuscript for detailed comments.</p> <p>Introduction Should be restructured. In several paragraphs it is mentioned and repeated that local knowledge is gathered by the farmers experience with their soils, this should be put linked and combined all in one paragraph.</p> <p>Methodology Explain why used dataset or methods are useful/necessary for answering the objectives. The title of the manuscript is "GIS-analysis" but there is no information on the performed GIS-analysis.</p> <p>Results & Discussion I think your manuscript would improve a lot, if you would include basic soil descriptions for the local soil names (either in the methods or results par). The expert approach part does not present any results, only methods. Please add the expert soil suitability map, otherwise objective 3 cannot be answered properly. The discussion is missing. I do not think the objectives are discussed neither are the used methods or problems that occurred.</p> <p>Conclusion New results are presented in the Conclusion. Make sure to link the objectives of the study to the results.</p> <p>Improve and add Figures Fig. 1: add scale, increase font size for District names, name study area Fig. 4: add soil names, the Figure is supposed to show delineated soil boundaries by the farmers but there is not a single soil unit named. In this way the figure does not have any value. Should Fig. 4 represent the farmers' soil suitability map? If so, the preferred crops remain unclear. Add farmers and expert soil suitability maps (for cocoa, citrus and oil palm) for a visual comparison of both results</p> <p>Improve Table captions Table 1 & 2: From my point of view cocoa, oil palm and citrus, and rice are all food crops. Therefore it is unclear what is meant by the column heading "food crops". Table 3: make clear if 1 or 3 is the best value for suitability</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	A few typos (mainly regarding case sensitivity) and double spaces	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The objectives of the article are clearly formulated although they are not novel but they are not answered in the manuscript. The manuscript lacks structure (methods are presented in the results, results in the conclusion) and literature, especially regarding other studies on local soil/crop knowledge.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juliane Krenz
Department, University & Country	University of Basel, Switzerland