



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_47162
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Carbon, Nitrogen and Phosphorus Status and Variation across Disturbed and Intact Tropical Coastal Forest Sites
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

	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	<p>Manuscript title: The term evaluation captures status and variation. so rename title to Carbon, Nitrogen and Phosphorus evaluation of disturbed and intact tropical coastal forest sites in Tanzania</p> <p>line 187-189: Your analysis is non parametric. So why use parametric statistical approach as shown in figure 2? I suggest you do not use linear graphs but multivariate analysis to find patterns and trends.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>ABSTARCT Reduce to 250 words. The study provides useful information for local management strategies as it sets initial basic data on..... sentence too long. recast to short sentence. Line 24 to 26: plz remove. Line 6 to 10: plz summarize into a sentence of two/three lines.</p> <p>Keywords are too many: reduce to 5/6 words.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION line 30 to 33: sentence is too long. break it up line 42: incorrect English Line 56 etc.: modern citation in APA has no., e.g. Pan et al., should be Pan et al. line 59/60: incorrect citation Line 69: remove and change to danger etc. The introduction is poorly written. It must be reduced to 500 to 700 words maximum. So many redundancies. It appears like thesis instead of journal manuscript introduction. I suggest total overhaul of introduction. it comprises of what is known, what is unknown and what is about to be known. Line 43 to 50: should be moved to last paragraph of introduction. It appears to be part of the research objectives. Line 30 to 65: should be summarised into 2/3 paragraphs.</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHOD clearly indicate your soil sample collection protocol line 123-133: should be expunged or moved to footnote under materials and methods. Line 146: plz obtain copyright permission from (Ligate, Chen, & Wu, 2018) Join 114 &135 together Line 179: what is TN and TC at first mention? Line 170/171? how? plz provide GPS coordinates of the map. Line 183/184: equation should appear alone. use equation editor.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION results and discussions are supposed to be 4/6 pages. It becomes boring and disinteresting to read if bulky and wordy. Hence author should only present key findings and reduce it to six pages. all others should come as supplementary result/appendix.</p> <p>CONCLUSION LINE 415: change to suggests conclusion should not be written in present continuous tense. Plz change to past tense.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Overall there are lots of grammatical errors that needs to be corrected.</p> <p>REFERENCES: They appear acceptable and satisfactory.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nkwoada Amarachi Udoka
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology Owerri , Nigeria