



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14497
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of shelterbelt and land management on soil carbon sequestration in shelterbelt-pasture system at Charles Sturt University, Orange campus
Type of the Article	Journal 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	- Two methods are used to compare but it is not clear about which method's results showed what? Or the difference between those two methods. So, no meaning of mentioning two different methods of soil organic carbon measurement in abstract since this is not discussed/ mentioned in the manuscript (result and discussion section, conclusion). Weil et al., 2003 method is slight modification over Blair et al 1995 method. - Material and methods need to revisit and revise (line 96 to 104). Same word is repeated - Throughout the manuscript sample size (n) is not mentioned. It would be better to mention this for both seasons. - Line 198- Tree density need to be clear, in line 199 - 200 it is mentioned that density is 20, 9, 14 plant m⁻² in 3 locations resp., is this tree or shrubs or tree nursery plant? Or KM⁻²? Need to be clear in this section.	The two methods were not compared they were used because we wanted to measure two different types of soil organic carbon ie Labile and total organic carbon moreover, these two methods have been found to effectively measure different fractions of SOC Sample size has been included The tree density has been corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Line 58- One sentence is placed in one paragraph need to adjust with other sentences. It can be reduced in the manuscript. - Line 60- reference is missing in the reference list - Line 67- Reeves, 1997 is missing in the reference list - Line 73- Lal et al., 2004 is missing in the reference list - Line 96 to 104 – wordy - Line 99- [and] is missing between Kovac and Lawrie..... - Line 101- mm/a – it is not clear to readers	Noted, necessary corrections made. All missing references have been included



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Line 108, 133, 137- Use either fig. or figure • Line 149 - Spelling of labile • Line 156- Payne et al., 2003 is missing in the reference • Line 163- figure number need to correct Figure 3 by Figure 2 • Line 166- title of figure 2: TOC [% remove] • Line 177 – Figure 3:[space] Gen..... ... (spring [- S capital]) • Conclusion must be made clear in the conclusion section. It seems that it has been already concluded in the discussion section (Line 193) • Alignment of references	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• Use of abbreviations throughout the report • Line 177 and 179- it would be nice if some explanation texts are kept in between figure 3 and table 2 • Spacing between paragraphs • Figures alignment and caption adjustment [Center]	