



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/2088
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil Fertility Status of Cassava Fields in South Western Nigeria

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)
Whereas in some regions the data are scarce, the results of this study are relevant.*
- Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work).
Suggestions were made to improve this item.*
- Results & discussion *(Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*

It should be improved statistical analysis of the data, to support the argument that was better performed. Improving discussion.

- Conclusion *(Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)
See comments below*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
Replacing a quote from paper in Congress by scientific article.
- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
COMPULSORY REVISION comments	1) Rewrite this sentence: Information on nutrient status of soils of south western Nigeria needed in developing appropriate integrated nutrient management packages for cassava production is lacking. 2) Complement this information: Statistical analysis of soil data was carried out also. 3) Describe in detail the sampling sites, indicating the same in a sketch. 4) Review this phrase: The silt/clay ratio of the soils was low and ranged between 0.8 and 5.4, an indication of the high degree of weathering that had occurred in the soils. Quote a scientific article for this statement (silt/clay). 5) Include the statistical analysis in table 1. See the phrase in lines 214-215. Statistical analysis of soil properties by analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated that there were no significant differences at $P = .05$ between the two zones. Where the reader can see this results? 6) Reviewing the statements between lines 214 and 221, because there is no statistical evidence. Differences between means were small or the variation coefficient was high. 7) In line 297: The results do not allow conclusions about efficiency of nutrient use. Conclude based on the results obtained.	'Corrected' 'Corrected' 'Corrected' 'Corrected'. Sentence deleted. Means of soil properties for both zones are presented in Tables 1 and 2. Since ANOVA at 5% indicated no significant difference between zones for all properties, we believe a general statement (no significant difference at $P = .05$) suffices. 'Corrected' 'Corrected'



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1) Rewrite this sentence: No significant differences (P.05) were between the zones observed for soil properties measured. 2) Include: In line 70, include the dominant vegetation 3) Standardize: 800mm per annum or 800 mm/annum 4) Change: soil physical and chemical characteristics by soil physical and chemical properties 5) Include in the discussion: The relationship of organic matter with Exchangeable cations, especially in tropical soils. (lines 110 - 121) 6) Take care with precision of the methods: In line 122: Total N values of the soils ranged from 0.45 g kg⁻¹ to 2.76 g kg⁻¹. CHANGE TO: Total N values of the soils ranged from 0.4 to 2.8 g kg⁻¹. 7) Take care with precision of the methods: See the precision of P content. 39.95 mg P kg⁻¹. OR 40 mg kg⁻¹ ?? 8) Include: reference to critical level to P in soil to cassava production. Line 130-131 9) Table 1: See the precision (decimals) to N, P, Ca, Mg, Cu and Zn. 10) In the text the authors used the mean and median for the discussion of results. Standardize. 11) Include information: Discussed minimum and maximum contents of chemical elements, but they were not included in the tables. (Line 173) 12) Rewrite: Soil Zn was adequate in all soils (line 183) / The content of Zn was adequate in all soils. Observe the precision of the methods (2.88 mg kg⁻¹)	‘Corrected’ ‘Corrected’ ‘Corrected’ ‘Corrected’ ‘Corrected’ ‘Corrected’ ‘Corrected’ ‘Corrected’ ‘Corrected’ ‘Corrected’
--------------------------------	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	13) Rewrite: Soil Zn showed significant positive correlations with soil pH and extractable cations, correlation with exchangeable acidity was negative but not significant at P = .05 (Table 3). / Soil Zn showed significant positive correlations with soil pH and extractable cations (Table 3). Its not necessary to discuss not significant correlations. 14) Take care with precision of the methods: The median level of Cu was 2.03 mg kg⁻¹ / It is necessary two decimals??? The method have this precision??? What the agronomic importance??? Review this in all text. 15) Discuss the relationship between copper content with pHKCl and exchangeable acidity. 16) The text of lines 223 to 244 is revision or discussion? 17) This publication in the Congress of Australia has in a scientific journal. Reichert, J.M., Albuquerque, J.A., Reinert, D.J., Kaiser, D.R. (2010). Water retention, estimation and plant availability for subtropical Brazilian soils. 19th World Congress of Soil Science, Soil Solutions for a Changing World 1 – 6 August 2010, Brisbane, Australia. Published on DVD. / REICHERT, José Miguel; ALBUQUERQUE, Jackson Adriano; Kaiser, Douglas Rodrigo; REINERT, Dalvan José; Urach, Felipe Lavarda; CARLESSO, Reimar. Estimation of water retention and availability in soils of Rio Grande do Sul. Revista Brasileira de Ciência do Solo (Impresso) ^{JCR}, v. 33, p. 1547-1560, 2009.	‘Corrected’ deleted. ‘Corrected’ ‘Corrected’ Discussion ‘Corrected’. Sub headings introduced for better clarity. ‘Corrected’
Optional/General comments		