SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJSSPN_35268**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Tomato fruits yield and soil nutrients availability as affected by mulching and irrigation schedule on Potassium Chloride and Sodium Chloride treated soils**
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	**Abstract** Lines 5-13: Too long for this section and should be brief as details will be provided under materials and methods Lines 18-20. Are those percentages with respect to total yield. If yes, state it in full. Lines 24-29: I_7 being greater than I_4. Is this in relation to initial soil analysis or after harvest analysis? **Introduction** What is the economic value of tomato at study area and Nigeria in general? What is the consumption amount? Are there any short falls or production gaps? What are the current challenges to tomato production? Such information is necessary to enrich and justify the study. There is very little literature on KCl as against NaCl treatments. Line 61; What is CC? **Materials and Methods** What time of year was study conducted? How was irrigation water applied? How many times and at what periods was mineral fertilizer applied? How was fruit and biomass yield assessed (outline the method or procedure)? Line 91; What type of mulch was used Lines 114-119: Describe the various procedures used in the laboratory analysis as there are several standard procedures.	

	Lines 125-126: Is the biomass of one plant for I_4 and I_7 only 7.83g and 6.35g respectively? Authors may need to relook at this. Lines 133-134: Available information showed soil was very sandy (77% sand) and yet it was described as heavy. This cannot be true Lines 135-142: What type of material was used as mulch? Is it true that mulching has no positive effect on tomato growth and yield? Lines 148-168, 372-388; Explanation and results indicate that both mulching and irrigation had no significant effect on flowering. However, flowering in any crop significantly affects yield. What is this study seeking to achieve? Lines 374, Table 1: Units for biomass look unusual. Authors may want to look at it again. -Table 1 shows that all parameters measured showed no significant effects for all treatments imposed. Why? -Table 1 also shows that total fruit yield is less than marketable yield. This is not possible Line 209-217: Authors indicated that mulch application had no significantly effect on fruit yield and yet stated that much application on soil could offer a great potential for increasing yield. This is contradictory. Lines 220-229: Authors indicated that both mulch and irrigation had no significant effect on yield but again stated that these factors had an effect on marketable yield. This is difficult to understand and contradictory. Lines 237 -247 and 402 – 419: Information provided shows that soil used was acidic and sandy but yet was rich in plant nutrients particularly C, N and P. Large amounts of mineral fertilizer was applied to soil but there was hardly any response judging from the results obtained. Any explanation for these observations? Lines 298-301: Any explanation for irrigation having an effect on Ca, Mg, K but not Na? Lines 301-304: statement that “higher values of Ca, Mg, K	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	resulting from I_7 irrigation treatment has received more water …….”. Is this true? Lines 305-308: Much had no effect on tomato growth and yield but has a significant effect on the soil that supported the tomato. Why and how? **Conclusion:** Lines 354-364; Since treatments imposed did not have any significant effect on tomato growth and yield, current conclusions cannot hold since they are not supported by any facts/data from this study.	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 110: Language indicates study is yet to be conducted. Line 113: Indicate initial soil sampling depth Line 114: the word “they” should be changed to the” Line 124: explain biomass Line 294-295: figures provided in text are quite different from figures provided in table	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript should be re-organized with valid and conclusive statements or arguments that are supported by data from this study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***M. M. Buri***
Department, University & Country	***CSIR – Soil Research Institute, Kumasi, Ghana***