



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>)



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>The procedure and methodology to be followed for sampling (horizons and by wetlands) is not clear in the drafting of the document.</p> <p>The type of experimental design or type of experimentation is not specified, and the verification of the normality and homoscedasticity criteria for the development of correlations is not declared.</p> <p>The principal components analysis (PCA) did not consider the exclusion of composite variables such as: CEC, CIC, BSCEC and sum of bases, nor did the KMO criterion available in the statistical package used.</p> <p>For this reason, it is NECESSARY to repeat the low PCA considering the criteria that were not taken into account and that influences the veracity of the analysis and the reliability of the information.</p> <p>IT IS IMPORTANT TO OBSERVE THE ANNOTATIONS INSIDE THE DOCUMENT.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The objective of the work is not stated in the abstract, the tables must include a legend at the bottom of the same, table four is not mentioned in the text, table 12 is unnecessary, improve the presentation of table 13 (in the body of the document indicates which are the aspects to improve).</p> <p>Excessively long paragraphs, they should be separated, the tables should appear right after they are mentioned, not two paragraphs later or show them and then mention them.</p> <p>The bibliography is outdated (this marking is specified in the body of the document)</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The study is pertinent and very well conceptualized since the problem addressed at the local level occurs in many forms in different regions of the world, as well as the analysis that is developed, although I believe that it should be prosecuted before proposing a land use map, the presence and / or reach of heavy metals or metalloids as a result of industrial activity, and in general due to the anthropic factor, since they are located within the locality and as this aspect is not considered of importance, crops could be located in areas that Although they meet agricultural needs, the effects of this type of metals could multiply the effects they are already having today.</p> <p>The way to introduce the topic is correct, but the use of updated references would place the reader in a contextualized panorama.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	José Leonardo Ledea Rodríguez
Department, University & Country	Mexico