

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of SOIL?

Yes. It could help for understanding if you address also the specific research question you are addressing already in the introduction: what is the soil type of urban garden soils in the case study area? How do different management practices effect nutrient content and availability of the soils? Why do women farmers chose certain soil management techniques?

2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?

The combination of soil analysis and qualitative analysis is a novel approach.

3. Does the paper address soils within a multidisciplinary context?

yes

4. Is the paper of broad international interest?

yes

5. Are clear objectives and/or hypotheses put forward?

Yes.

6. Are the scientific methods valid and clear outlined to be reproduced?

Yes

7. Is the soil type/classification adequately described?

8. Are analyses and assumptions valid?

yes, yet in two lines of argumentation you could be more specific regarding the interpretation of the soil nutrient data: you write “often a larger portion of the nutrients was water soluble or exchangeable”(p. 10,3) and “some of the nutrients” (p. 11,31), when from the figure it appears that this is only true for Mg and Ca. Also it is not clear from the conclusion which management practice (manure only; manure and intercropping for N enrichment; or manure and intercropping for second income) can be recommended for use by other urban farmers.

You mention that information on daily activities varies too much, in order to be analysed. Did you check for the total work burden of women (can be calculated from the typical working day)? This could give important insights on which management practices are feasible to women. Also the often quoted FAO report that states women could be 30% more productive neglects that women often have higher work load than men, that restricts them in using certain yield increasing methods.

9. Are the presented results sufficient to support the interpretations and associated discussion? yes

10. Is the discussion relevant and backed up?

Please check the discussion for not introducing new results (e.g. p. 11, l. 1-7; l. 16-22 should be in the results section) Discussion could be shorter and highlight important points, i.e. soil analysis results that (recommended practice) of intercropping led to lower soil nutrient content. Extension failed to see needs of farmers for second income crop.

In presenting the FGD results it is not clear in which FG men were present and whether knowledge differences of men and women could be detected.

11. Are accurate conclusions reached based on the presented results and discussion?

See above.

12. Do the authors give proper credit to related and relevant work and clearly indicate their own original contribution? Yes

13. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper and is it informative?

Still I don't like the direct link of knowledge to nutrient content, maybe: Women's farming practices and their effect on soil nutrient content in the Nyalenda urban gardens

14. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary, including quantitative results? yes

15. Is the overall presentation well structured? yes

16. Is the paper written concisely and to the point? Yes, but please check to prevent iterations of the same lines of arguments.

17. Is the language fluent, precise, and grammatically correct? Yes

18. Are the figures and tables useful and all necessary? Yes, maybe include a table on members of focus group discussions and interview partners?

19. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used according to the author guidelines?

20. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? See above

21. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? yes

22. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate and of added value?