



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_42668
Title of the Manuscript:	The status of microelements in the selected ERPP irrigation schemes in Unguja and Pemba Islands, Zanzibar
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 comments (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	❖ This study is not detailed soil survey rather surface samples were used for analysis and not soil from genetic horizon of profile pit i.e. A, B and C horizon. This need to be recast. ❖ The status of Zn which is low in all the location and not adequate in Kwalempona as claimed. Fe status is also high in all location and not low or medium. This should be corrected. ❖ Geographic coordinate should be indicated. ❖ Methods for pH determination should be included in the materials and methods. ❖ Depth of soil sample should be reconciled i.e. 20 cm or 30 cm depth.	❖ This has been recasted (see text) ❖ This has been corrected (see text) ❖ Not indicated, we fill that the present situation is enough ❖ Method of pH determination has been indicated ❖ Depth of sampling has been reconciled
Minor REVISION comments	❖ Map showing the study area including the state and country is also important. ❖ In presenting the result, soil pH should come first followed by the micro element. ❖ When discussing result, the level significant should be stated, i.e. highly significant or not significant. ❖ Keyword should be reduced and irrelevant one to this study should be removed. ❖ Recommendation should be based on the study findings; this is in reference to OM. ❖ Statements which are not your finds should be acknowledged by adding relevant reference as pointed out in the paper. ❖ Level of significant should be defined under footnote in the entire table.	❖ The state and country has been included ❖ The chronology has been followed ❖ The significance level has been stated wherever necessary throughout the MS ❖ Key words have been reduced ❖ Corrections have been done accordingly ❖ Level of significance has been described as per reviewers comments
Optional/General comments	❖ The pattern of discussion should be formatted as advised. ❖ Tables should follow immediately they mentioned.	❖ The pattern of discussion has been followed ❖ Tables have been placed immediately wherever they are mentioned