



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_36777
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF SOYBEAN RESIDUE MANAGEMENT ON NITRATE NITROGEN ACCUMULATION AND SUBSEQUENT SORGHUMYIELD IN KANHAPLIC HAPLUSTULTS OF WESTERN KENYA
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>)

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	1. Experimental replication should be stated clearly in the Method. 2. The result and discussion (3.1 and 3.2) should be rewritten for clarity and easily be understood. A lot of sentences in the results and discussion are unclear what the author wish to explain. 3. The author just discussed N-NO₃ at the depth of 0-15 as indicated in Result and Discussion. Other result at soil depth of 15-30cm and 30-45cm was not found in the manuscript. The result should be presented, otherwise, omit it from Materials and Methods.	1. Simple experimental design as was done in the field has been given to aid clarity. 2. The authors are of the opinion that the results and discussions presented in the manuscript are clear. 3. The depths 15-30 cm and 30-45 cm have been omitted from materials and methods as these depths were not considered in this study.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Table 2 should mention the depth of soil collected.	The soil depth under study was 0-15 cm.
Optional/General comments	1. The author presents a good experimental data; unfortunately, some part of the Result and Discussion need rewritten for clarity.	Thanks for the comment. Having omitted the depths 15-30 and 30-45 cms, the authors find the results and discussion to be ok.