



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10659
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATING THE IMPACTS OF LAND DEGRADATION ON THE QUALITY OF SOILS AND THEIR VARIATIONS BETWEEN DIFFERENT CLUSTERS IN MOSIRO IRRIGATION SCHEME
Type of the 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	A brief description of material and methods must be included.	The materials and methods were described in details as indicated in the text.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Check the figures indicating in the abstract such as phosphorous 71.8% which is different from text.	Phosphorous decreased by 71.8%. This figure is in both text and abstract. It can be confirmed because I have now marked them in the text with red colour.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Only the conclusions are given in the abstract.	No. The abstract gives the results of the research and its conclusions. The research constituted an investigation into the impacts of land degradation on soil quality by examining the soil quality attributes in the year 2002 and 2012 and the abstract highlights on this. Conclusions contain more details than abstract as should be expected.