



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
For the two added paragraphs under "Soil sampling **" paragraph, you write differently "and the result carbon (mg/g) were reported as air-dried basis percentage carbon" in the first paragraph and "and the quantity of C were converted to air dry basis percentage C" in the second one. Check it and harmonize for "C" or "carbon" anywhere. Also, it is still not specify what method for "TOC content" and which one for "Labile carbon", specify. The method mentioned that carbon was expressed in mg/g, and the results are in %. Check and correct. You have also to put another sentence explaining how C% was converted into mg/g and/or Mg/ha. Under the table 3, you begin the sentence by Table 2. Check it. In the Abstract, you wrote "To determine the SOC level in the sample, two permanganate oxidisable methods were used: the Weil et al. (2003) method and the Blair et al. (1995) method.". Remove author's names in the abstract and change it by "TOC" and "Labile C" analysis methods. The abstract is very less informative : - No TOC content nor labile C data, - there was significant difference between sampling sites- Weston 1 site showed higher level of carbon than Leeds Parade and Collage 4. - This may be attributed to topographic difference among the sites. - the proportion of carbon higher in autumn sampling than spring sampling, is explain by the higher vegetation, microbial activity and warmer climate in autumn.	carbon and C harmonized The TOC and labile carbon methods were specified in the paper "To measure different fractions of SOC: labile carbon and TOC in shelterbelt-pasture system at Charles Sturts University paddock in Orange Campus, the KMnO_4 oxidation methods of Weil et al., (2003) and Blair et al., (1995) were followed respectively" we have included how carbon (mg/g) and carbon (%) were calculated Author's names have been removed More information added to the abstract