

Editor's Comment:

After reading the manuscript and the reviewers' comments I have the following remarks

1. English language needs editing in some parts of the manuscript.
2. The last sentence of the Abstract should be more informative. Which combination was the most effective and what was that based on?
3. Although the statistical analysis is well performed, it is very difficult to see the real differences between treatments (even between major factors and not within the interaction). I know this is quite difficult when having such a mass of data, but I really do not see if the two higher SSP treatments differ or not or which PM dose rates differ considering total P fraction (Table 4). This should be clearly demonstrated, probably by giving the LSD values near the probability symbols.

I believe the manuscript could be accepted for publication after considering these minor changes.

Author's Feedback:-

The manuscript has been edited while the last sentence in the abstract has been re-written to state the most effective treatments as observed during the studies.

However, SAS (2000) was used as the statistical package for the statistical analysis of the results of the experiment and it was observed that the major factors i.e. single superphosphate and poultry manure was highly significant ($p < 0.0001$). The main effects were further separated using Duncan Multiple Range Test. Further presenting the main effects alone will mean creating additional tables which will totally alter the manuscript.