

Editorial comment:

After reading the Editorial comments and that of reviewer OC, I believe that the manuscript still needs improvement. For example, the English have been improved, but in some cases still need editing. In the abstract there are abbreviations without stating prior what they mean. My question as that of OC reviewer is on the CD (statistical analysis) and $q\text{ ha}^{-1}$, what are these? These are not standard units, so the authors should state clearly what they mean. Furthermore, the discussion section is poorly written, as there are 99% results and 1% discussion. The authors just state that they agree with these researchers without trying to give an explanation of their results, based on other researchers findings or even based on properly justified assumptions.

These are the reasons for which I believe that the manuscript should be further improved.

Author's feedback:

I appreciate your suggestions but as per reviewer OC, I have been already improved manuscript as per reviewer comments and earlier reviewer agreed after corrections regarding statistical analysis and discussion part also. Unit $q\text{ ha}^{-1}$ always use for higher yield data's in quintals, hear I agreed with your suggestions and show all yield data's in kg ha^{-1} . Respected sir discussion portion according to manuscript or results and enriched with suitable references please see carefully and I am also justified all commutes as per reviewer OC. My humble request and I hope you will proceed MS for publication.