



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_49973
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF FARMING PRACTICES ON THE CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF SOIL IN SMALL SCALE TEA FARMS IN KIRINYAGA AND THARAKA-NITHI COUNTIES OF KENYA
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>)



**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>REFERENCES</b></p> <p>-First of all, the referencing style used in the text does not conform to journal guidelines. The author should rearrange the references in the text using numbers in brackets, [ ], E.g. In the introduction, the first three references should be written as follows: "The interactions of the nutrients also affect the availability of each other either positively or negatively [1], [2], [3] ...</p> <p>-Secondly, the corresponding references used in the text should be numbered accordingly in the reference list, sequentially.</p> <p>-The reference "Njogu et al. (2013)" has been written twice in the reference list. One should be deleted.</p> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b></p> <p>-It is important to give the full meaning of KTDA.</p> <p>-The method used for analysis of exchangeable acidity, total organic carbon and available nutrients should be referenced.</p> <p>-The units "me%" is not standard. Change this either to meq/100g or cmol+/kg</p> <p>-The conclusion should be improved and let it reflect or support the findings of the study.</p> <p><b>I suggest that the introduction and discussions should be improved with the following references:</b></p> <p>- Sitienei, K., Kamiri, H. W., Nduru, G. M., &amp; Kamau, D. M. (2018). Nutrient Budget and Economic Assessment of Blended Fertilizer Use in Kenya Tea Industry. <i>Applied and Environmental Soil Science</i>, 2018.</p> <p>- Li <i>et al.</i> (2014). Effects of organic and other management practices on soil nematode communities in tea plantation: a case study in southern China. <i>Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science</i>, 177(4), 604-612.</p> <p>- Chong, K. P., Ho, T. Y., &amp; Jalloh, M. B. (2008). Soil nitrogen phosphorus and tea leaf growth in organic and conventional farming of selected fields at Sabah Tea plantation slope. <i>Journal of Sustainable Development</i>, 1(3), 117-122.</p> <p>- Hajiboland, R. (2017). Environmental and nutritional requirements for tea cultivation. <i>Folia Horticulturae</i>, 29(2), 199-220.</p> <p>- Wang, L. M., Huang, D. F., Fang, Y., Wang, F., Li, F. L., &amp; Liao, M. (2017). Soil fungal communities in tea plantation after 10 years of chemical vs. integrated fertilization. <i>Chilean journal of agricultural research</i>, 77(4), 355-364.</p> <p>- Zhu, R., Zheng, Z., Li, T., Zhang, X., He, S., Wang, Y., ... &amp; Li, W. (2017). Dynamics of soil organic carbon mineralization in tea plantations converted from farmland at Western Sichuan, China. <i>PLoS one</i>, 12(9), e0185271.</p> <p>- Qiu, S. L., Wang, L. M., Huang, D. F., &amp; Lin, X. J. (2014). Effects of fertilization regimes on tea yields, soil fertility, and soil microbial diversity. <i>Chilean journal of agricultural research</i>, 74(3), 333-339.</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The paper attempts to investigate the influence of farming practices on soil chemical properties under small-scale tea plantations in some counties of Kenya. The choice of the methodology is good. However, I have raised some concerns with respect to laboratory methods and statistical analyses. These need to be addressed. The language of the manuscript is good and very few technical/grammatical errors have been identified. The choice and use of references is not encouraging. I have proposed some articles that will help to improve on the background of the study in the introduction. These will certainly help the authors too in their discussion of results.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Georges Kogge Kome</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Dschang, Cameroon</b>