



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_49591
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution of some Macro Nutrients and Chemical Properties in some semi-arid soils of Borno state
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

	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>The study tries to evaluate the distribution of some macronutrients and soil chemical properties in some semi-arid soils of Borno state in Nigeria. Unfortunately, the study has serious limitations for it to be fit for publication.</p> <p>The first question I ask is; "Is the study evaluating spatial, temporal or depth-wise distribution of soil properties"? The study cannot answer any of these because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The study makes use of only three (3) composite soil samples within the whole study area, covering about 70,898 km² as indicated by the author, wherein spatial distribution cannot be evaluated and appreciated. In other words, a data set of three points within such a vast area is very minimal to statistically appreciate the variability and/or distribution. (2) Only one soil depth (0 – 20 cm) has been considered in this study, wherein we cannot talk about depth-wise or vertical distribution. (3) The study does not reveal how sampling was done. i.e. the study does not indicate the rationale for choosing the three sampling sites. Where they selected based on differences in parent materials, vegetation, topography, etc. ? <p>Secondly, the write-up of the manuscript is very much limited in terms of a scientific writing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The language is not very good and needs much revision. (2) The introduction of the manuscript is extremely inappropriate. I observed that the introduction actually contains no relevant information directly linked to the subject matter. In general, an introduction should give a background of the subject matter under consideration or a review of the topical issue that is addressed in the paper, supported by appropriate references directly linked to the subject matter in question. With the background, the author can then bring out the research problem (or gaps as identified in the literature) and thus the objectives of the study. Unfortunately, this has not been done. (3) As concerns the results, the manuscript barely reports the results of soil analytical data and there is basically no discussion – this is not surprising because a prior background study has not been done in the introduction. In addition, the author constantly makes use of the adjectives very high, high, low, and moderate, especially in the abstract. However, the methodology does not give any prior critical levels that can be used for comparison. <p>As concerns the analytical data reported in the study, it would have been appropriate to measure soil pH in water and KCl and not only in 0.01M CaCl₂ so as to have an idea on the charge (ΔpH) of the soils.</p> <p>As concerns soil acidity, it would have been important to report values of exchangeable acidity (i.e. exchangeable H⁺ and exchangeable Al³⁺) so as to confirm if the Effective CEC (ECEC) is indeed greater than the CEC as reported by the author.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Georges kogge kome
Department, University & Country	University of Dschang, Cameroon