



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10230
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF SOIL NUTRIENT BALANCES IN ORGANIC BASED CASSAVA (<i>Manihotesculenta crantz</i>) AND SORGHUM (<i>Sorghum bicolor</i> (L.) moench) CROPPING SYSTEMS OF YATTA SUBCOUNTY, KENYA
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Add the sample collection and calculation method, ie. Atmospheric deposition, BNF, Leaching, Volatization and Erosion in different system. Since TC including cassava and sorghum, the main plot should have 30 treatments (table 2)?	Reference to methods of calculation given i.e. Stoovogel and Smalling, 1990; Smaling et al., 1993 Right but they are treated as parallel experiments each having 15 treatments
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The input and output of nutrient (from table 4 to table 9), should be taken apart into IN2, IN3, IN4, OUT1, OUT2, OUT3, OUT4 and OUT5 for different crop system and fertilizer application method, a total balance could be shown by last table. More detailed introduction could be given. More detailed discussion about the utilization of different crop system and fertilization in different soil and rainfall environment obtained from the results or others reference should be given in "Results and discussions". The "Abstract" and "Conclusion" section more concise.	This has been looked into with slight changes made in order not to change the focus, content and intent of the study.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		