

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS FROM REVIEWERS

Comments/suggestions from Reviewer: Third Version

S/No	Comment/suggestion	Response
1	Were there any statistical analyses done to the data? This is not apparent at all and type of analyses missing in the methods section	In this type of study, no statistical analysis was used
2	The authors need to reword some statements to minimize the use of the phrase "The results showed..." which appears at least 3x in the abstract.	These statements and others have been reviewed and revised as per reviewers comments
3	The Conclusion fails to answer the objective	The objective of this study was "to assess the soil fertility status in the selected irrigation schemes of Mpwapa District, Dodoma Region, Tanzania". In the conclusion, these results provide soil fertility status in the selected irrigation schemes. The data also suggest that soil pH and excessive Na^+ in the soil are the major soil fertility constraints to crop production in the area followed by Ca^+ , SOM and CEC. This information could be incorporated in the soil fertility management in Tanzania thus contributing significantly in the efficient utilisation of land resources in the study areas. In my opinion, this answers the objective of the study.
Line 59	delete word "crop" before productivity	The word has been deleted as suggested by the reviewer
Line 104-5:	Delete phrase "by means of"	The phrase "by means" has been deleted instead of "by means of" as suggested by the reviewer
Line 173	Total Nitrogen abbreviated to Total N not TN	Correction has been made as suggested by the reviewer
Line 177	There is some repetition on the rating of the soil attributes	I found no repetition as suggested by the reviewer. So, nothing has been corrected.
Line 195	What is meant by good "quality" SOM, are the authors not referring to "quantity"	Good quality SOM implies organic materials with relatively fast mineralisation of N. This happens when the C:N ratios are between 8 and 12. So, no corrections were made.