



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?)*
- 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)*
- 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?)*
- 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)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- 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)
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract- Well written and self explanatory. However, in the objective section, while the authors claim that the study was designed to provide information on soil fertility status of some soils in the area and also identify constraints to cassava production, the study actually did not report on the latter objective. I therefore suggest that the authors should remove the second objective. Introduction- Well written. Literature on the topic is also well reviewed. Should however provide literature to support the statement in line 27. Material and Methods. This section needs to be reinforced with some basic information such as population density in the two sites, current soil fertility management options being used by farmers and cropping systems (fallowed period; rotations etc) and average farm size. Results and Discussion: This section is also well written and discussed with relevant literature. The Authors should however address the following, though minor: 1) Provide reference(s) for statement in lines 112-114. Authors should also provide reference(s) for the statement 'Fertilizer procurement in Nigeria is plagued by (Line 237-	" Corrected" "Corrected" "Corrected" "Corrected." Other authors cited.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	238). 2) Information on current use of fertilizer in Nigeria should also be addressed. 3) Provide the specific dates for the references Adepetu and and Sobulo and Adepetu as cited in FAO, 2000. 4) The sentence 'The place of micro-dosing in cassava production might be assessed' line 256-257 should be revised. 'Needs to be assessed' instead of 'might be assessed' might be a better phrase. Conclusion: Ok. References: Line 370- 'A.M' in front of the name of Fermont should be removed. This particular reference seems to be incomplete. Should check. Line 387. Hylkema reference should be properly written. The following references are missing in the reference list although they have been cited in the text: 1) Lal, 181 2) Tabo et al. 2006 3) Snapp et al. 2008 The following references have not been cited in the text and yet are in the reference list: 1) Hillocks, R.J. (2002) Nweke et al. (2002) in the reference list should be moved down from its present position in line 393 and placed immediately after Mweke, F.I. (1994)	"Corrected" "Corrected" "Corrected" "Corrected" "Corrected" "Corrected" "Corrected" "Corrected"
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper should be accepted after minor revision	