



EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>Thank you for considering as a editorial decision for the manuscript entitled "SOIL MECHANICAL COMPOSITION AND TEXTURE AS INDICES FOR ON-SITE AND FIELD PRECISE CHOICE OF LAND USE TYPE TO ADOPT" I thoroughly went through the manuscript, reviewers report and author feedback/ comments. I suggested some important points here for the benefits of Manuscript.</p> <p>1. Abstract should be formatted as per the journal guideline such as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1. Study aims2. Backgrounds3. methodology4. result5. conclusions <p>2. There is no need to insert table number in the introduction section.</p> <p>3. Conclusion should be re structured.</p> <p>4. It can be accepted after revision provided authors must be compliant with all the corrections/suggestions.</p> <p>5. All the sections of the manuscript must be justified and proper alignment as per journal format.</p>	<p>1 The abstract has been completely revised to make it thick. The background, study aims, methodology, result and conclusion are included.</p> <p>2. Table number in introduction has been removed .</p> <p>3. Conclusion has been concretized by emphasizing how land use and management decisions are taken in the field by mutual adaptation and adjustment.</p> <p>4. Revision has been done as highlighted and both authors have complied with all the corrections and suggestions.</p> <p>5. All the sections of this manuscript is being justified and proper aligned with the journal format.</p>