



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_62665
Title of the Manuscript:	Pedogenic and contemporal issues of fluvisol characterization and utilisation in the Wetlands of Bamenda Municipality, Cameroon
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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>Dear authors and editor, the paper is very interesting and the topic could be considered to be published if the authors consider to include some improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is not informative and needs more clear information about goals, methods and implications. 2. Intro: There is no mention to a strong background about soil geography studies, the necessity to link economic and environmental studies or digital mapping. 3. Methods: For me, it is not possible to accept a paper about soil classification using old soil classifications, the new ones come from 2015. Update all the paper. A PCA with 6 factors is too much, you need 3 or 4. More is confusing and not clarify the results. 4. Results: The tables are too big, I suggest moving some of them to the suppl. Material. There are not pictures of the soil profiles, just general ones. The discussion is too general. The authors need to reduce more and more the description of the results. Now, it is too weak to read all the numbers and descriptions. 5. Conclusions: There are not conclusions, so.... For me, this is key and indispensable. <p>Please, see more comments in my attached pdf.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jesús Rodrigo-Comino
Department, University & Country	University of Valencia, Spain