



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_14328
Title of the Manuscript:	Active Soil Organic Carbon Fractions and Aggregate Stability effected by Minimum Tillage and Crop Rotations on a Marginal Dryland Soil in Punjab, Pakistan
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organize the introduction; to be more directly and improve the language = English; 2. In material and methods describe the real activity (I found only one depth and after the authors showed me 3 different results), write the difference between both "TOC"; 3. Do the same way at results, from the beginning at the end (Your results are very important, do not use them like "examples"), put only tables and figure you will show and discuss; 4. At conclusion, do not write a results abstract, write only "conclusion"; 5. The references are in different formatting. 	OK
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>For minor revision, or for me directly revision, I put in yellow in the text; Problems in the line:</p> <p>69 127 132 140 169 198 220 288 432 – Fig. 3a 440 – Table 1 442- Table 2 452 – Table 3</p>	OK



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript should be accepted with same corrections; Congratulation for the paper!	
ethical issues in this manuscript	Yes, there are. The authors are responsible about all results and discussion, they do not have faults and no subs write the responsible.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Carla Stieven
Department, University & Country	Tropical Agriculture Post-graduation Program, Mato Grosso Federal University, Brazil