



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_43255
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of anaerobic digestate potential as organic fertilizer in improving wheat production and soil properties
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, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The subject of the manuscript actual but oriented mostly practically than scientifically. Nevertheless, recent important investigations in the field of the use of anaerobic digestate should be mentioned. It is recommended to compare authors' ideas and findings with already published papers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A.Aladjadjiyan, D.Penkov, Ann Verspecht, A.Zahariev, N. Kakanakov (2016) Biobased Fertilizers - Comparison of Nutrient Content of Digestate/Compost. <i>Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</i> , v.8, issue1, p.1-7 2. A. Zahariev, Sv. Kostadinova and A. Aladjadjiyan (2014). Composting Municipal Waste for Soil Recultivation in Bulgaria. <i>International Journal of Plant & Soil Science</i> 3(2): 178-185, 2014; 3. Aleksandar Zahariev, Dimo Penkov and Anna Aladjadjiyan (2014). Biogas from Animal Manure – Perspectives and Barriers in Bulgaria. <i>Annual Research & Review in Biology</i>, 4(5): 709-719, 2014 	The suggested references have been cited. (Line 200-202)
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Row 40 – “won’t” should be changed.</p> <p>Row 62 – either “a good choice” or “the best choice”.</p> <p>Row 94 – please define ECe.</p> <p>Row 150 and row 284 should be synchronized.</p> <p>Row 253 – this reference does not appear in the text.</p>	<p>Won't has been changed to would not (Line 41)</p> <p>“The best choice” is changed to “a good choice” (Line 63)</p> <p>ECe is defined as Electrical conductivity of Extract the change has been put in brackets (Line 95)</p> <p>The suggested lines have been synchronized</p> <p>The reference has been deleted from the list of reference</p>
Optional/General comments		