



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_40545
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of status and variation of exchangeable bases across disturbed and intact tropical coastal forest sites in Tanzania
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 (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	Please, Consulting PART 6: <u>General Comments</u> Title: Mapped soil fertility status includes analysis of ionic components and organic compounds (organic matter), which was not determined in this manuscript. It is suggested that we explain this in the title by including the following term: "Mapped soil fertility status based on CEC and variation across disturbed and intact tropical coastal forest sites in Tanzania" Abstract, Lines 18-22: "... 3.75, 3.11 and 0.63 for Ca²⁺; 0.80, 5.87 and 6.67 for Mg²⁺; for CEC and for base saturation in three areas: closed forest, agriculture and livestock " Introduction, Lines 32, 36-37: to modify Introduction, Line 39: Reference number 5 is missing. Introduction, Line 44: Reference number 8 is missing. Introduction, Line 61: Wrong numbering. The references [11,13] should be [11,12] Introduction, Line 63: Wrong numbering. Reference [12] should be [13] Introduction, Line 73: Wrong numbering. Reference [19] should be [17] Introduction, Line 75: Wrong numbering. Reference [17] should be [18] The Introduction is adequate and well referenced. However, it can be revised, and some paragraphs can be merged into a single paragraph. The revision of the list of references should be done, because the numbering is not in the correct sequence. Site descriptions, Line 97: term 'elevations' Figure 1, Line 108: There is no reference to sampling sites. Line 106: Wrong numbering. Reference [19] should be [20] Line 127: [26] to [27] ??? Line 135: [27-29] Line 151: Confirm equation 2 X100 and not X100% Lines 19 and 174 and Table 1, Line 202: Natural and preserved soils (CFS) can present a rapid reduction of ionic concentration in soils by the absorption of forest vegetation. In soils modified by agriculture (ADS and LDS), the ions can be leached from the surface layers by the action of rainfall and even wind (in the case of phosphorus in the coastal area). The calcium standard, shown in table 1, followed this trend, with a large difference of variation between CFS and agricultural soils. But this was not observed for Mg, K and Na. How to explain the low difference of variation between CFS x ADS for Mg, K and Na? Can be occurring leaching of non-adsorbed ions to the soil? Do the soils in the area (ADS and LDS) both have good vegetation cover? Explain better in the discussion. Table 2, Line 220: Why CEC between CFS vs. ADS was low and between CFS vs. LDS was high? Explain better in the discussion. Line 265: [31-33] The discussion is adequate, only missing more depth in the explanations requested above. References are appropriate and up-to-date. Line 321: Reference [39] was not described at the end of the article. The text is well written, requiring only a few revisions and corrections.	Evaluation of soil fertility status based on CEC and variation across disturbed and intact tropical coastal forests sites in Tanzania Because of the changes in the title, there are some changes in line 11 in the abstract section Lines 18 to 22: The reviewer's comments have been done as in Line 20 to 22 of the revised manuscript (RM) Lines 32, 36-37 have been modified as suggested (See part two of lines 31,34and 35 in the RM Line 39: Reference 5 is put instead of 4 as in Line 37 of the RM Line 44: Reference 8 has been added as in Line 41 of RM Line 61: Revision done as in Line 58 but the order is [13,14]. Line 63: Revised as in seen in line 60 of RM (Ref.15) Line 73: Revised as in line 70 (Ref. [10,14] of RM Line 75: Revised as in line 71 (Ref. [21] of RM Line 97: Revised as in Line 94 of RM Line 108: A new figure with sampling sites put to replace the former one (see the figure line 106) Line 106: Citations revided as in line 103 of the RM Line 127: The reference has been edited as in Line 125 [Refer.30]. Line 135: The citation has been edited as [31-33] in line 133 of RM Line 151: The equation has been revised as in Line 149 of the RM The comments have been accomodated in Lines 255 to 262 of the RM Revision done by revisting data analysis which have resulted into productio n of new values and trends of results in table Table 2 (line 217) and paragraphs between lines 202-208, and 210-216 as in the RM Line 265: The citations have been edited as Line 271 as [14,35,36] in the RM Line 321 Reference 39; This reference has been affected by the changes of reference in the whole RM and so they are numbered [9,34,42] as in Line 327 of the RM Paragraphss 1 and 2 Merged, Some Improvements made in the conclusion. The order of the list of references has been improved and all are in the text



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Conclusion: To approve with Minor Revision.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Please, Consulting PART 6: <u>General Comments</u>	