



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_AJEA_3446
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF AGRICULTURAL LIME ON SOIL PROPERTIES AND WHEAT (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) YIELD ON ACIDIC SOILS OF UASIN GISHU COUNTY, KENYA.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	Lines 33-35. Change to 'The two varieties compared were 'Njoro BW 2' and 'KS Mwamba' characterized as tolerant and moderate tolerant to soil acidity, respectively.' Change throughout the manuscript: kg/ha⁻¹ or t/ha⁻¹ to kg ha⁻¹ or t ha⁻¹, respectively. Lines 39-40. Rewrite this sentence omitting 'P and N addition' because P and N were added in all subplots. So, they did not represent treatments of the experiment. Line 49. Put keywords in alphabetic order. Line 51. Change to '... is one of the most important cereals...' Lines 52, 60, 65. References not included in manuscript literature. Line 76. Change to 'Kochian et al., 2004'. Line 87. Check: Kamprath 1994 or 1984? Line 91. The No1 manuscript objective is included in No2. So, must be omitted. Lines 89-95. Authors did not state what the necessity of this experiment conduction was, as long as the effects of lime treatment to soil pH and to nutrient	Correction done Correction done Correction done Correction done It is the first most important crop-in the world.probably among the important cereals in other country Only the reference in line 65 was not included. Correction done. Correction noted though not used in AJEA Correction noted though not used in AJEA Correction done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	availability are already well known. Lines 103, 111. Change 'conducted out' to 'conducted'. Lines 108, 117. Change to Jaetzold et al., 2006. Line 123. Was the plot or the subplot size 4x4 m? Line 128. Change 'harvesting' to 'harvest'. The same throughout the manuscript. Lines 132-143. Materials and methods have not been clearly provided, so that 'another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described'. i.e. 1. Seeding equipment, 2. Harvest area in each subplot, 3. Harvest method, 4. N and P uptake method, 5. Soil characteristics methods, 6. GFB, TCV,NFB and MRR calculation method have not been stated. Lines 144-146. Authors must state if 1. Data of soil analyses were subjected to statistical analysis, 2. Data of P and N uptake were statistically analyzed, 3. Data were analyzed across site or separately for each site. Lines 174-177. Is there any statistical analysis supported these results? Figures 1 and 2. Very thick lines and small size make the figures confusing. Line 201. If P and N were applied in all subplots, should not be reported as treatments.	Correction done Correction noted When harvest is used instead of harvesting There will be grammar mistake. Correction done in the current manuscript. Correction done. Correction done. Indicated below each figure Correction done Correction done
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 203-204. Were data analyzed across experimental site? Figure 3. Authors must explain why available P was not increased, as lime was increased in soil, for Njoro BW 2. Figure 4. Authors must explain why wheat yield in Chepkoile site did not differ among 1, 1.5 and 2 t lime ha⁻¹ treatments. Figures 5 and 6. What is the source of these available P values? Available P was greater than 10 in these figures, but lower than 10 in the figure 3. Lines 265-267. This result is not true for P uptake. According data presented in the figure 7, there are no differences among P uptake values. Also, the LSD values are not presented. Discussion. Very poor discussion. Authors must lengthily discuss their results with other reported in international journals. References. Most references are not published in international journals. Also, some references are uncompleted.	Correction done The available P was increased in both varieties as indicated in figure 3. Except the increase of available P in Chepkoilel site was low compared to Kipsangui site Now included in the current manuscript. Figure 3 in the initial manuscript was wrong-Correction has been done. Indicated below the figure. Improved Correction done.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		