



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_3572
Title of the Manuscript:	An Assessment of Spatial Variations of Some Soil Properties under Different Land Uses in South-Western Nigeria

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Editor's comment	Author's comment
Compulsory REVISION comments	My opinion is that this MS should not be accepted in the present form. The principal problems are the following: AIMS: They are not clearly expressed in the introduction. If one goal is to compare soil properties in fields under different land use, so different land uses must have more or less the same amount of years under every land use. And the definition of land use in M&M do not include this information (for example, in the cassava/maize treatment). The M&M section is not clear either. Treatment 4 does not explain which tree or shrub species are present. I do not understand treatment 5 (building site). Line 66 (and others): It is difficult to compare soil fertility because the parameters concentrations and the statistical letters are in different tables. Line 70: ¿There was more nitrogen in FO treatment? There are not any reference to nitrogen analysis in M&M nor in the table 1. Line 84: Was N measured or not? What about Zn? Again, no reference of these elements in M&M Tables: They are not adequately presented. Units of all parameters are missing in all tables. There is no	This is not attainable in an area where there are pressing needs for lands for usage with quicker economic returns. The most important thing here is how land use (vegetation) affects land use. This is what this study centres on. Timing is not a criteria/factor of emphasis here. Tree species found in the study area include Pentaclethra macrophylla, Basqueria angloansis, Guarea spp., Mimosa spp., Cola gigantea, and there is a wide spread of Elaeis guineensis and these were dominated by the presence of Chomolaena odorata, a perennial weed found in fallow lands in south western Nigeria. Again, 'building site' was used to reflect the negative implication of clearing any land for construction without ascertaining its suitability potential for agricultural uses. This is necessary as a guide in reverting the diversion of good agriculturally lands to non-agricultural purposes. Nitrogen determination had been reported appropriately in the materials and methods. The statistical letters had been effected. The units had been inserted. The suggestion for statistical analysis is noted for further research. Meanwhile, the analysis employed here are Analysis of Variance and the means were separated by least significant difference (LSD). Co-efficient of variation (CV %) was employed for grouping of soil properties.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	information about the plus/minus numbers (are they standard deviations? Or standard errors?). The statistical letters are absent in table 1, but they appear in table 3a. It is confusing for the reader. Table 2 seems not important except the last column, and this column could be included as a last column in table 1. I do not understand why tables 3a and 3b have those names, they present different results. Table 3b shows comparisons among treatments, taken "one against one". It would be more logical to compare them using multivariate methods.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 16: the first reference citation in the text must be [1] Line 17: replace "This" for "This fact" or something similar, here and along the rest of the MS (line 9, etc) Line 18: the sentence is wrong, there's something missing Line 62: include at least the names of the methods (not only the reference) Line 206: The beginning of the sentence is not grammatically right	This section could not be traced at all in the document in that the numbering had changed following the previous corrections.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		