



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
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I still consider that the MS can not be accepted for publication. Many flaws I pointed persist. The major flaw is data analysis. I see too many tables and too little information there. Perhaps the only important table is table 1. The rest can be deleted without affecting the principal ideas. I have suggested before to gather all tables in one. For example, to add another column in table 1 with the significance symbols of table 2 (last column). Table 3 shows the statistical letters for mean comparison. Here, again, the view is confusing because all averages are compared among them. It would be better to compare only along each row, it has no sense to compare mean values of different chemical parameters. I would include these letters in each cell of table 1 instead of the errors included there (it is not said if they are standard deviations or standard errors). In this way, one single table would indicate which treatments are different from which. Other important flaws: • Authors speak of "fertility decline" all along the text. They can not speak about "decline" if samples along a certain period of time have not taken or analysed. • Table legends are not very informative. For example it not known if data in tables refer to 0-15 or to 15-30 depth layer of the soil. • Table 3b presumes to indicate which parameters are statistically different	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	between some pairs of parameters. If it is the case (I am not sure of this), pH can not be different between treatments CM and OP (first row of the table) as it can be seen in table 3a similar letters) and in table 1 (the same value 6.1 for both). • Some phrases in the text are wrong or unfinished, see lines 130, 151 and others. • In line 102 it is said that soil of treatment CO is more fertile than other land uses. Where is it showed? As table 1 lacks of statistical letters it is impossible to compare the fertility parameters among treatments. Finally, I go on thinking that the MS have not been improved enough. I consider that it must not be accepted for publication in AJEA. If it is wholly improved, it could eventually be accepted for a Short Communication, not for a full article.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Keywords: look for others. "Land use" and "choice of land use" is the same. "food insecurity" and "fertility decline" are not subjects directly involved in the MS. • The references in the text are not ordered alphabetically (the first reference cited must be [1], and so on).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The English grammar needs to be revised	