



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_32538
Title of the Manuscript:	Carbon Sequestration and Soil Carbon Stock under Maize/Legume Cropping System in Alfisols of a Savanna Zone, Nigeria
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The title is confusing as Carbon Sequestration and Soil Carbon Stock are often used interchangeably by authors but were used to mean different thing by the author. Thus, carbon sequestration, carbon stock, carbon storage and carbon pool are often used by authors to mean the same thing in many literatures. Therefore, using carbon sequestration and soil carbon stock in this context is repetition. The author should choose one out of the two, either carbon sequestration or soil carbon stock. Preferably, the title can be adjusted to read: Soil organic carbon concentrations and stocks under maize/legume cropping system in Alfisols of a Savanna Zone, Nigeria. The author did not follow the journal format in citing literatures. See my corrections in ref. 1 and 2 of your introduction section. Use the journal approved font theme and size to adjust the manuscript. Use only one paragraphing style in the manuscript. Note that you used two styles. The author failed to show the field preparation procedures. The author did not indicate the plot size used in the field study. Soil sample collection procedure was not properly written. For example, the author only outlined the	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	procedure used to collect the composite soil sample. Were there no soil sample collections at harvest in each of the two years planting? Report as such in your materials and methods section. Do you feel that there was difference between the method of determining soil organic carbon stock and soil organic carbon sequestration as presented in your laboratory methods of determination? At what spacing were these two crops (soybean and Desmodium) drilled? Were these fertilizer elements you used in the study applied as basal application? Was the bulk density of the soil determined at intervals during the crops growth stage? If yes, what was the reason behind this practice? See your presentation in 2.2 of the results section. Note also that it was not reported as such in the materials and methods section that soil sampling was done at intervals during the crops growth stage and the reason behind the practice. Your results pattern of presentation took the same style. Try to change at least the beginning of each parameter result presentation and discussion. Why did you choose to use standard error means as against LSD value in your Tables? Bulk density was earlier presented in Table 2, why is the repetition in Table four? If there will be need for this, it should be presented as a correlation or regression analyses which must be in graphic form. Therefore, modify the content of Table four.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Try to reconcile the title of Tables 4 and 5. Your presentation in Table 4 is all about soil carbon sequestration and soil organic carbon in the studied soil. Table 5 presents soil carbon sequestration in different soil aggregates.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author fails to understand that an organic carbon input is different from soil carbon sequestration. He also fails to understand that soil carbon stock is relatively the same as soil carbon sequestration. There was lots of mix-up in using these key words in the text and needed to reconcile to avoid confusing the readers.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is an interesting one.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>John Chukwu Nwite</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Crop Production Technology, Federal College of Agriculture, Nigeria</i>