



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_IJPSS_3121
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil Properties Dynamics at Varying Heating Temperatures during Agricultural burning.

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 <i>(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)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript addresses different burning intensity on soil properties but the manuscript appears too confusing, and this makes it difficult to follow - The materials and methods were muddled up such that some basic information is lacking (e.g. duration of study, the soil information, the methods of determination of selected soil properties, etc.) while the grammar is generally poor, and thus require being re-presented. - The results and discussion section was not properly written while it appears that the authors were even confused on most statements of fact, which calls for a big question on the maturity of the manuscript to be presented for publication by now. - Table 2 - The authors should check the total sum of the sand, silt and clay particles of the control plots - Table 3 – The computation of the ECEC is not correct. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>The sum of the exchangeable bases (Ca, Mg, K and Na) and exchangeable acidity did not tally with the values of ECEC recorded in the table. Even then, the unit of exchangeable acidity should be the same with the bases. Also, the acronyms used in the table must be defined as footnotes under the table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Table 4 – This table is not well prepared. I am actually expecting the authors to present this type of table in a matrix form. This will help to explain the relationships among the variables.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The editor should consider the comments by the reviewer for further actions.</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer