



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_5787
Title of the Manuscript:	Selected soil chemical properties in some traditional irrigation schemes of Mpwapwa District, Dodoma Region, Tanzania.

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The revised version represents an improvement over the original version, but there are still some issues to resolve before acceptance for publication:	
1. That I requested for how the soil sampling was done to be included in the Abstract does not mean the authors should include some information (which are more suited for the full length paper) in the methodology section of the Abstract.	1. The abstract has been revised to accommodate the suggestions by the reviewers
2. I think 'soil physicochemical properties' is more technical than 'physical chemical soil properties'.	2. The soil physical chemical word have been corrected as suggested by the reviewer to read as soil physicochemical anywhere the word appears in the MS
3. Please why the combination of two styles of citation in Line 127?	3. Line 127 has been corrected as it was a typo error
4. Still the English of the manuscript is poor. I take Lines 135-138 and 284-286 as well as the first and last sentences in the Conclusion (Lines 332-334 and 336-338) to drive home my point.	4. The suggested Lines in the MS have been corrected for language
5. You can measure exchangeable bases in cmol (+) kg^{-1} because these basic elements are considered individually and they bear charges. As for the CEC in which all the charged entities are considered as a whole, it is not proper to use this unit of measurement; instead use cmol kg^{-1} .	5. The CEC unit has been changed from cmol (+) kg^{-1} to cmol. kg^{-1} anywhere it appears as suggested by the reviewer
6. Most of the data in Table 1 are repeated in Fig. 1, why?	6. The table has been corrected to separate the data that appears in both the Table 1 and Figure 1 as suggested by the reviewer
7. Please express the values for the soil pH in Table 3 to at most one decimal place.	7. The pH values in Table 3 have been corrected to one decimal place as suggested by the reviewer
8. As a matter of brevity, having data for SOC and SOM (whereby the latter was derived from the former) in one table (as in Table 3) may not be acceptable. So also is the discussion of these two variables in the paper.	8. The data has been corrected accordingly
9. In Tables 3 and 4, if you refer to 0-50 cm soil depth at topsoil, what then constitutes the subsoil?	9. In the suggested Tables 3 and 4, there was a typo error and 0-50 cm soil depth has been corrected to 0-20 cm as suggested.
10. The choice of the term 'nutrient balance' in Table 4 is wrong after my opinion, as your study merely determination of soil physicochemical properties.	10. The term 'nutrient balance' in Table 4 has been corrected to read as Cation Ratio.
11. You have to seriously reconcile Tables 3 and 4 as regards unnecessary repetition of data.	11. Tables 3 and 4 have been reconciled to avoid unnecessary repetition of data.
12. In the Conclusion section, 'Our results suggest that soil pH and excessive Na^+ in the soil followed by Ca^+ , SOM and CEC are the major soil fertility constraints to crop production in the area.'	12. The suggested section in the MS have been revised as suggested