

Editor's comment:

The revised manuscript submitted has been revised incorporating the suggestions of the reviewers. Nevertheless, after reading the manuscript myself, I found that there are some issues that were missed during the earlier review process.

1. 1. Any soil with a pH less than 7 is acidic. Soils at both the experimental fields had a pH of 4.9 and 5.1 which is acidic. Therefore the title is misleading as there is no non-acidic soil (pH greater than 7) in the present study.

2.

2. 2. 'Foliar' is misspelt as 'Folia' throughout the manuscript. This has to be corrected.

S 3. Soil nutrient availability to plants decreases with a reduction in pH due to the abundance of ions like aluminium and iron. These changes in nutrient availability in response to changes in pH should be discussed briefly in the introduction.

M 4. More information should be provided in the methods section. What was the climatic condition during the experimental period? What were the cultural practices (irrigation, weed management, etc.)? Were the data (especially the percentage values) were checked for normality prior to ANOVA?

5.

5. 5. Whenever relationships between variables are mentioned, they should be proved statistically. For example, in 148 the relationship between micronutrient concentration in plants and formulation has been mentioned. But it was not statistically proved.

6.

6 6. The author's should be clear of the number of sites in which the study was conducted. Is it two or three? See Table 3.

7.

7. References listed should be according to the journal format.

I had marked other comments directly on the annotated manuscript.

Author's feedback:

1. The issue of pH is no longer a controversial because I have removed acid and non-acid from the write-up.

2. The correction has been effected of foliar.

3. This is noted.

4. Necessary information has been provided on climatic conditions. The data collected were not secondary data but primary data.

5. This has been re-presented.

6. Necessary correction has been effected on the mix-up.

7. References have been adjusted accordingly.