

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_41970
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Soil Fertility Status for Bambara Groundnut Production in South-eastern Tanzania
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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 agree highlight that part in the man his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title: Assessment of fertility status of soils of South-eastern Tanzania. Abstract: Delete the first sentence and begin the abstract with objective. Your abstract has no relationship with the text crop in question. Why? Introduction: your introduction has not addressed any soil factors that are required for production of any crop including the Bambara groundnut production. You are supposed to state the major nutrient elements requirements, soil conditions limiting the growth performance of crops and the climatic conditions (rain fall and temperature, etc.) favourable for the production of the crop. Methodology: The map is not clearly presented. Line 138: The use of DTPA for acidic soils is not conventional not acceptable. It could be used in Alkaline soils. The use of DTPA as an extractant for extracting micronutrients and in fact heavy metals is misleading. EDTA is versatile and appropriate for both acid and alkaline soil conditions. Line 157: The word soil type is wrong. Soil type may be referred to soil parent material (eg, sandstones, shale, alluvia deposits, etc), soil order (entisol, ultisol, alfisol, etc), etc. In this case, soil texture should be used. The textural classes for Mikangaula1 and Mpeta 2 should be loamy soil (LS) and not sandy loam (SL). Results and discussion: the results are poorly presented and no discussion. The author merely interpreted the results. The major findings are not compared with previous studies to ascertain academic contribution. No inference was drawn with respect to the text crop. Interpretation is based on generalization crops grown in the area. In an academic study like this one, one is expected to know the nutrient requirement of the text crop, relate what is in the soil with what is needed by the crop. You cannot say the nutrient is low or high, instead, what the farmer want to know is if, the nutrient is deficient in soil and what is to be done to remediate the situation to boost the crop performance. Reference: Number 8 reference was not cited in the text. Numbers 4	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript did not justify the purpose of the study and in line with the set objective to assess the soil fertility and the productivity of Bambara groundnut. For the article to be publishable major work is required. Information on yield of the crop in the area and yield of the crops where the fertility status is ideal is expected. What has been the trend of the yield performance? The recommendation is just a blanket or basal. It should be quantitative. What is the rate of organic or inorganic fertilizer that will be required to bring the status of the soil productive?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ernest Eteng
Department, University & Country	Department of Soil Science and Meteorology, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria

reed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and anuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write