



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_44164
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Nitrogen Sources and Polymer Coated Fertilizers on Wheat Yield in Sandy Soil.
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 (I agreed with reviewer, I have correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript.
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1- The author used the N rate; 45, 68, and 90 kg/fed. How did you select it? The interval is not same. You should use standard unit, e.g kg ha⁻¹ rather than kg/fed.</p> <p>2- The introduction is well organized but there are many mistake concerning with English grammar.</p> <p>3- The objectives are not cleared. You want to compare the PCU and others concerning with yield, N uptake, N-RE, AUE PUE etc. It should be clarified.</p> <p>4- In your treatment, the N source and rate are easy to understand. However, time of fertilizer application is not clear. All fertilizers are applied 50% at pre-plant and 50% at heading? If so, it is not treatment.</p> <p>5- According to your results, PCU at 90 is the best, getting yield. But the discussion is weak why PCU at 90 got higher yield and the other got lower yield.</p> <p>6- The data in Table 3 is same to those of Table 2.</p> <p>7- There is no data for nutrient uptake, in grain, and straw.</p> <p>8- In your data for NRE, the values are too low. It is strange data. Please present the total N uptake.</p> <p>9- In figure concerning with nutrient availability in soil, the N rate in Figure are not same to the rate you used.</p> <p>10- In your conclusion, 90 kg/fed of PCU is the best. It is the maximum rate you used. If you use more than 90, what will happen to yield? What is the normal N rate or current recommended N rate for wheat. Should compare and conclude PCU is more efficient or less efficient.</p> <p>11- Referencing is not systematic. It is not formatted.</p>	<p>1- I have corrected this part according to your suggest, my manuscript pages(1,3)highlighted with yellow color</p> <p>2- I have corrected this part according to your suggest. highlighted with yellow color</p> <p>3- I have corrected this part according to your suggest, my manuscript pages(2)highlighted with yellow color</p> <p>4- I have corrected this part according to your suggest, my manuscript pages (2 - 3)highlighted with yellow color.</p> <p>5- I have corrected this part according to your suggest,. my manuscript pages(4)highlighted with yellow color</p> <p>6- I have corrected this part according to your suggest, my manuscript pages(8)highlighted with yellow color</p> <p>7- I have corrected this part according to your suggest, my manuscript pages(8)highlighted with yellow color</p> <p>8- I have corrected this part according to your suggest, my manuscript pages(8)highlighted with yellow color</p> <p>9- I have corrected this part according to your suggest, my manuscript pages(10-11)</p> <p>10- I have corrected this part according to your suggest , my manuscript pages(12)highlighted with yellow color</p> <p>11- I have corrected this part according to your suggest.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	- Nil	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- Nil	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	