



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_16572
Title of the Manuscript:	GIS-Based Assessment of Land Suitability for Industrial crops (cotton, sesame and groundnut) in the Abyan Delta, Yemen
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In general, the manuscript should be acceptable for publication but some serious problems must be repaired prior to publication. It needs some significant improvement. Some suggestions are as follows: 1- Most recent references in the literature are 2010 which is almost old. Please include some relevant references from recent years. 2- The terms GIS must be defined in line 35 not in line 36. Once the term is defined, no need to repeat in the following paragraph (example, line 71, 102). The same goes to the DEM and other used abbreviations. 3- All the maps must be support by standardized annotations including , scale, legend, north arrow and coordinate system (projected or Geographic) 4- Delete figure 3 as it doesn't show anything 5- There is something wrong with conceptual model in figure 4. The figure showing a simple overlaying process for thematic maps. Integration and modelling with GIS after reclassification is meaningless in your workflow. please re-establish your workflow according to the basic concept of GIS 6- What is the units of elevation in figure 5, Slope in figure 6, ... and what does mean negative value (-15) in your DEM.	1- References are revised and updated. 2- Ok corrected based on your suggestion. 3- Ok corrected based on your suggestion. 4- the figure removed. 5- I think this figure shows the concept of the model, so it could be simple for better understanding to the reader. 6- Ok both figures were reproduced and the legends were revised. Sure, the unit of elevation is (m) and slope in (% or degree).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7- Resolution of maps is not good enough for publication. I do suggest increasing the quality of maps in way that annotations can be read easily. 8- How did you generate the PH, EC, CaCO₃, CEC, nitrogen? If those are based on the soil samples, I suggested authors to provide the soil sample coordinate map and explain a bit about the interpolation technique which have been used. 9- The conclusion is very short even I should say there is no conclusion here. I advise author to improve the conclusion part substantially. Conclusion has to be expanded based on the objective of the study.	7- Yes, you are right. However, all maps were reproduced, homogenized and notations become clear. 8- Actually, all soil samples have coordinate and the soil characteristic maps were generated based on Kriging technique in GIS. Hence, based on your suggestion, soil sample coordinate map is provided and brief explain is given. 9- Ok, the conclusion revised and improved.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		