



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_47482
Title of the Manuscript:	Leaf litter decomposition in the sudano-guinea savannahs of Ngaoundere Cameroon: Patterns of decay rate as related to litter traits?
Type of the Article	Original Research paper

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>Overall: English must be deeply reviewed.</p> <p>1) No hypothesis was presented in the manuscript. What is the hypothesis?</p> <p>2) The objectives (in the Abstract and in the Introduction) must be rewritten according to the hypothesis tested. The objectives presented in the study are not specific enough.</p> <p>3) Material and Methods</p> <p>How was the drying process of litter? The temperature? How to ensure complete removal of moisture through air-drying?</p> <p>Considering the fact that the litterbags was covered with vegetation, may have altered the humidity and the incidence of solar radiation?</p> <p>Item 2.4: What is colometric method? I guess it is colorimetric.</p> <p>Item 2.5: In abstract, authors point out that a single exponential model was used to determine de decomposition coefficient. In section 2.5, authors point "several mathematical models" assuming the heterogeneity of substrate used in the decomposition process. This information is inconsistent. This study is not specifically about types of mathematical models but about the decomposition process. I suggest that authors choose the model appropriately based on the concepts in the literature and review this information and results. If this is the real intention of the study, rewrite the objectives and title of the work.</p> <p>4) Discussion</p> <p>The discussion should be reviewed. Item 4.1 indicates the quantitative results of the study and descriptions of other studies. The discussion should be performed by interpreting the results obtained based on evidence from other studies.</p> <p>5) Conclusion</p> <p>The conclusion should be written considering only the results obtained in the present study. In the form in which it is written, it seems a discussion once it presents bibliographical references.</p> <p>In the introduction, the authors comment on the decomposition as a process of replenishment of organic matter and nutrients. Can the results obtained in this study provide support for this statement?</p> <p>6) Number and quality of figures and tables are acceptable.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Marcela Bianchessi Da Cunha Santino
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal De São Carlos, Brazil