



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_40352
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Nitrogen Rates on Growth, Carbon Assimilation and Quality of Water Spinach (Ipomea aquatica)
New title:	Effect of Nitrogen Rates on Growth and Quality of Water Spinach (Ipomea aquatica)
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>In first submission (Original Ms_ARRB_40352), line 87-88: The authors declared that "The nitrogen sources used were from the NPK green fertilizer (15:15:15)". However, In revised Ms_ARRB_40352, line 91: The authors revised that "The nitrogen sources used was single fertilizer Urea (46% N)." The authors should be explained this changing because "NPK green fertilizer (15:15:15)" is fully different than "Urea (46% N)." I think that there is a big mistake in the manuscript because "NPK green fertilizer (15:15:15)" is fully different than "Urea (46% N)." I did not decide which one is true. The authors should be explained this situation, logically. And also I would like to learn while all the changings were highlighted with yellow color, why this revision was not highlighted yellow color.</p>	<p>Actually, we use UREA (single fertilizer) not NPK fertilizer (compound fertilizer) in the experiment. This is because we want to look of the impact of Nitrogen solely to the parameters of Ipomea aquatica. The use of NPK fertilizer would not described the impact of nitrogen on I. aquatica because there were potassium (K) and phosphorus (P) inside the fertilizer. We mistakenly put NPK fertilizer in the first draft of the paper. If we use NPK we should explain about the impact of K and P in the literature review. Thank you for your great comment.</p> <p>The change have been highlighted with yellow (line 90)</p>