



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_35760
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of sapropel addition on soil properties and tomato yield in the open field in the south of West Siberia
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 13: Aims : Line 1: Replace been attracting for attracted	done
	Line 3: Move properties from after yield to after soil	done
	Line 4: Delete reference from abstract Simply referring to major soil chemical and microbiological properties	Unfortunately, we are not clear on the point, so could not perform required changes.
	Line 2: Delete Technically	done
	Insert a footnote below Table 1 defining the unfamiliar symbols used	done
	Present the latitudes in two decimal places	done
	Line 96: Delete the error message	done
	Line 133: Explain the experimental design used e.g. RCBD or Factorial?	We added the following: Experiment was performed in factorial design, and the order of experimental units in each sites was randomized.
	Line 145: Consider reporting in third person such that instead of surprisingly our use Interestingly, this study found...	done
	Line 146: Explain why the results of the present study may have found higher yields than those of other authors	It might be due to many factors, such poorer soil properties in the European part of Russia, for example, or less solar radiation, different plant density, cultivars etc. making this comparison we wanted to show rather high yield in our study and to place it into a reported values range. Without accounting for all the major differences the explanation can be too voluminous and distracting from the major line, would it not?
	Line 194: Delete error message	done
	Line 210: Present the data on soil properties. Though statistically insignificant, they may be numerically different which if presented as a figure may visually enable the reader understand the effects and the numeric differences also need to be discussed	The data on soil properties are presented in Table 5.
	Line 222: Delete error message	done
	Line 224: Explain why sapropel addition influenced microbial properties	Without studying the mechanisms, there might be much speculation about it; but usually microorganisms are more responsive to all kinds of additions



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The data on soil properties at the beginning and end of the study can b combined and presented in figures	It would require addition of much material and a change in the text; besides, we believe it would not contribute much to the main result.
	Line 243: The explanation may be that the effect of C and N on tomato quality parameters may not be as direct as that of K due to the role of the different plant nutrients in plant physiological processes.	Yes, of course; we added a line to this effect into the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Consider revising the title to Effect of Sapropel addition on selected soil properties and field Tomato Yield in South west Siberia.	<p>If the other review agree to the change, we are eager to effect it; so we added the second title highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your thorough review and useful comments!</p>