



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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1.Change rate of sapropel to kg ha-1. i.e, 450 kg ha-1.	done
	2.abstract: last paragraph: change estimated to determined.	done
	3.results: second line :CHANGE 8.8 kg/m2 to kg ha-1	done
	4.Line 35: 2.5 bln m-3. What is bln? Write it in full.	done
	5. line 39: change resuming to increasing.	done
	6. table 1: Define all the terms in the tables and place the units in brackets,	done
	7. line 96: delete <i>error bookmark not defined</i> .	done
	8.Line 128: write o.d in full. Oven dry weight?	Yes; done
	9. line 133: cite reference for the statistical package used.	done
	10. Line 148:What is sums In the sentence.? You may have to recast the sentence.	The meaning was "temperature sums", i.e. the sum of temperatures over the growing period; but we recast the sentence
	11. line 151 (Tab. 2). Write tab in full.	done
	12.lines 151 and 152: In agric, research the P values usually used are either 1 % (0.01) or 5 % (0.05). . Explain your P values (e.g. P = .016, 0.07 and 0.000)	We quite agree that the levels of significance chosen for drawing conclusions are as indicated by the reviewer; but we preferred to show not the levels, but the actual values for probability of the null hypothesis.
	13.line 159: insert ...at the expense ofbetween growth plant and fruit in the sentence.	We are afraid we did not fully understand this point, but changed the sentence to make it more clear.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	14.line 170: Change Tab. 3 to Table 3.	done
	15. Table 2: see comments for Table 1 and effect corrections.	done
	16. Foot note below Table 3: $P = 0.05$	It would not be correct, since we highlighted in bold only the results with $P \leq 0.05$.
	17. LINE 191: CHANGE TECHNICAL TO PHYSIOLOGICAL.	done
	18. LINE 194: Delete <i>error bookmark not defined</i> ,	done
	19, Write all Tab. 4, 5, 6 in full.	done
	20. line 223; DELETE ERROR BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.	done
	21. Write Fig, in full (Figure).	done
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Good piece of work.	Thank you very much for your thorough review, useful comments and nice general comment! It means a lot for us indeed!