



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_37480
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of more Indices of Sulfur Availability in Soils for Wheat Production in Ethiopia
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>)

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	It should be explained why 54 samples of wheat were taken from the rows next to border rather than from the middle of plot and 27 samples were grinded for laboratory analysis, not 54	The main objective(s) of the study were to make plant analysis at the booting stage of wheat growth or at the early flowering stage. There were 12-rows of wheat plants per plot: 2 borders in both sides of the plot, & only 1 row next to one of the borders was used to take plant tissue at that vegetative stage (booting). The remaining meddle rows were for taking grain yield data & the seed samples for different nutrient contents analysis. So, those middle rows to be used for taking agronomic or yield data at harvest should NOT be disturbed.  The 54 plant samples were taken just to estimate or calculate relative yield & sulfur uptake on dry weight basis, at booting stage. But, half the amounts (i.e., 27 plants) were again randomly selected from oven dried 54 plant materials, because still only 0.5g ground sub-samples are needed for the wet digestion analysis, as it is not necessary to grind the whole 54 plant samples.
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The manuscript is well written and shows important results	