



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJPSS_6883
Title of the Manuscript:	An integrated soil fertility management decision support tool for coffee: model structure and calibration for Northern Tanzania

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Lines 1-4: Title: The title is complicated and should be changed to a simpler one. Because, the “system” is not clear; direct target of “developing” is a model; calibration itself is a method (procedure) for developing a model, and an appendix matter. Abbreviation (ISFM) should not be used in title. Title is better to be “Developing a coffee yield prediction model using integrated soil fertility management for northern Tanzania” or similar one like this.</p> <p>Line 19:(more than 1.5 m) should be (usually more than 1.5 m), considering the author's response.</p> <p>Lines 101-104 and 124-126: If Tables 1 and 2 were not derived by the authors, citation should be added in just below Tables 1 and 2.</p> <p>Lines 155, 157, 195, and 403:“Maximum yield” was used, but “maximum possible yield” was also used in line 280 and in abstract. If maximum yield is the same with maximum possible yield, either “maximum yield” or “maximum possible yield” should be used consistently.</p> <p>Line 205: “Figure 5.1” should be “Figure 1”</p> <p>Lines 204-205: From the author's response, “physiological nutrient use efficiency” and “maximum possible yields per tree” were used as the plant factor in addition to the plant density. Those two factors should be added in Figure 1.</p>	<p>It is becoming even more complicated I think. We are not using ISFM to make a model; rather making a model that will be used for ISFM recommendations. If we follow the suggestion, the title would look like “Developing a coffee yield prediction and integrated soil fertility management recommendation model for Northern Tanzania”.</p> <p>Noted and adjusted.</p> <p>Noted and incorporated.</p> <p>Noted and adjusted.</p> <p>Adjusted.</p> <p>Adjusted.</p>



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

<p>Line 227: The meaning of the parameter fD should be provided in the text or in the Table of “DEFINITIONS, ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS”.</p> <p>Lines 302-308: In Fig. 3, a statement that 16 points = 4 fertilizer rates × 4 plant densities. 12 points = 12 different NPK combinations should be added just below each figure for easy understanding.</p> <p>In addition, the possible reason that why the difference was observed in % value (i.e. the difference of 80 % and 100%) should be provided in the text.</p> <p>Appendix 1: According to author’s response, at least Appendix 1 is required, but there are two appendixes. Appendix 2 should be deleted.</p> <p>In addition, the use of appendix is unusual for an academic paper. Please examine if the appendix 1 could be included in the text.</p>	<p>Noted and included in the list of acronyms.</p> <p>Adjusted</p> <p>Explained as the result of varying fD in the fertilizer density trial whose % value approached 100.</p> <p>Insisting of having both appendixes unless they imply a violation of some specific rules in this journal’s publications.</p>
--	---