



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Consistency in the use of the units should be maintained throughout the paper i.e. either use mg/kg or mol/kg and not mixing 2. A lot of literature from the nearby area exists, hence author should consult these published literature instead of relying on publications from elsewhere. E.g. publications by Hemp et al, Mathew et al, Winowiecki et al, etc 3. Soils on the slopes of Mount Kilimanjaro are acidic in nature due to the parent material. Therefore, higher contents of Al and as well low pH in the highland areas. This fact should be articulated in the explanation. 4. The method is not clear especially on the altitude of the study site, temperature, rainfall and distance apart among the 10 plots. All these issues merit a bit of explanation in the methods to allow easier follow up by readers 5. Conclusion should be based on the current study and not speculations. Authors can not claim other factors were responsible for decline of coffee cultivation, while the study was not looking on those factors such as coffee markets, fertilizers etc 6. Author seems to give recommendation for every nutrient element studied. This gives contradictory conclusion, for instance you can not claim that organic matter content is higher and then at the same time you recommend addition of animal manure; for what then?	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In the Discussion section, author should NOT repeat figures/numbers already presented in the Tables. This is totally repetition and does not add any value. The author should direct their arguments directly instead of reproducing the figures/numbers again 2. Conclusion part of the study is not convincing i.e. soils are suitable for coffee cultivation hence decline in production is not associated with soils. I think it is good to stick to the main theme of soil fertility status but should not dwell in conclusion on productivity. 3. Author should revisit literature and use more current literature less than 10 years, except for those few detailing the methods. A lot of understanding on soils have changed, hence one cannot rely on literature dating back 30, 40 to 50 years.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is good, but should avoid giving speculations. It should stand on its own findings and avoid giving conclusions based on speculation as this may water down the good information it is supposed to contribute in the literature.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Mathayo Mpanda Mathew</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>EU Delegation to Tanzania, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania</i>