

Author's feedback:

In my response to some of the comments by the reviewers, I have the following to say:

(1). On accusation of plagiarism: It was an act of over exaggeration of what really happened. Truly I must have made some mistakes in not given enough attention to the references as stated but the reviewer was extremely blunt and I think this is not good enough. Some other reviewers did excellent work at improving the manuscript.

(2). Productivity of coffee. This could be in two forms (a) Economic productivity in terms of coffee berry which is primary to the farmers. (ii) Drymatter yield and nutrient uptake could be regarded as indices of productivity particularly when dealing with greenhouse research. No one should expect us to be referring to berry production in the greenhouse. In addition, the total drymatter yield of the coffee seedlings in this study has been published in another Journal. It will be unethical on our part to bring the same information to this present publication. The information contained in this publication has not been published anywhere.

(3). Nutrient uptake is an indication of the performance of the crop as a result of the treatments. The information on the nutrient uptake of a crop will show whether the crop is doing well or not.

The reviewer should note that research must be unbiased and neutral. I cannot assume that nothing could happen to soil organic carbon after six months. I have made the corrections to the best of my ability.

Finally, I will like to state that the method of your peer review alarmed me in that your first corrections were followed to the letter but I was surprised again that you sent the same corrected version to another set of reviewers. Although it has significantly improved the quality of the work but the stress was quite uncalled for.