SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEE_33953**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of the fertility status of the soils under coffee cultivation in Moshi Rural District, Kilimanjaro region, Tanzania**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	It is known in the field of the writing of scientific articles that the bibliography must be recent and quoted according to the norms of the journal. In this article it is observed that the bibliography is very old (outdated). The level of updating of the article is determined observing the references consulted in the last 5 years of publication. It would be advisable to review more recent scientific papers from renowned tropical coffee producing countries like Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica that have great experience in the production of coffee and also good literature on this crop. On the other hand, it is observed that several citations that were made in the text are omitted (probably in an involuntary way) in the bibliographic references, which I describe: London or Landon ???, (correct); Valery (1983); Donahue et al (1971); Foth et al. (1978) FAO-UNESCO (1973) ILACO (1981) Moberg / 2001) Bradyet et al (19996) Ngugit et al (1982) Smith and Sanchez (1980) Uchara and Gilman (1980) Martin and Leonard (1969) Lindsay and Norvell (1978) or Linsay and Norvel ???, to correct	The paper has been modified and written as directed to meet the target aims. Most of the old references have been updated

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	It is known that the introduction of a scientific article should answer the question, because the research was done, that is to say the interest that has the subject in this case, in the context of the economy of Tanzania. Writing should be shorter with about the size of a sheet	All comments have been accepted and implemented
Optional/General comments		