



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_42340</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>REFLECTIONS ON EFFORTS GEARED TOWARD IMPROVED SOIL FERTILITY AND CROP YIELDS IN KENYA</b>
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The paper reviews soil fertility management initiatives implemented by researchers and the Government of Kenya to date. Specifically, the paper details the major limitations of the initiatives and proposes a framework for enhancing adoption of the soil fertility management practices by farmers. Although the subject is important to inform policies on soil fertility management in Kenya, the paper lacks rigor regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no clear research questions the paper sought to address. Rather, the paper just provide a literature review of soil fertility work conducted in Kenya</li> <li>• There is no clear methodology on how the literature/data was collected</li> <li>• There is too few data in the paper</li> <li>• The abstract is short of key study findings</li> <li>• The author(s) provide a conclusion yet there is no clear objective(s) to the paper</li> </ul>	Noted
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Line 6:</b> ....enhancing crop/agricultural productivity.....</li> <li>• <b>Line 7:</b> Many research-based what? Rephrase the sentence</li> <li>• <b>Lines 8-9:</b> Remove the word 'work' in Line 8. Revise this sentence. It is the impact of research on what? What was the research on? Over how what timeframe was the research conducted? Government and agricultural institutes of which country?</li> <li>• Integrate sentence in <b>Lines 8-9</b> with the one below (<b>Lines 9-11</b>)</li> <li>• Some key results from the study are missing in the abstrac</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lines 17-18:</b> Revise to.....Sub Saharan Africa, <b>including Kenya.</b></li> <li>• <b>Lines 19-21:</b> Break sentence. Too long</li> <li>• <b>Line 24:</b> Revise the sentence to....<b>the P supplied by</b>.....</li> <li>• <b>Lines 35-38:</b> Integrate the two sentences</li> <li>• <b>Lines 40-41:</b> Revise the sentence.....A survey of description of the first priority sites in the various districts in Kenya was 41 done and Uasin Gishu was included. What is Uasin Gishu? District or province?</li> <li>• <b>Lines 41-42:</b> The breakdown????? of soil properties referring to groupings of soil units was given</li> </ul> <p><b>Lines 52-54:</b> All fertilizer recommendations since then have been based on this report. However, this situation has changed with the release of the report, based on a smaller unit of sub-county. <b>Details of the report are required.</b></p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	NONE	