

Editor's Comment:

In my opinion the the revised version can not be accepted in the form as the suggestions made by the reviewers _Nnd and _Olo in the feedback form has not been fully addressed. In this form the authors should indicate where in the text (page and line numbers) they have revised according to the suggestions provided by the reviewers. For example, the reviewer _Nnd suggested to be brief in the experimental design details in the abstract, but I still see the abstract is full of these and very little of the results.

For example, if the results were not significantly different between 5 and 10 t/ha application, just briefly tell us the results of the 5t/ha results of the final yield components (12 wks after sampling), not at 3 weeks after sampling or other intermediate results. I don't see any discussion of the results in general. For example, why the final yield component results were not significant between the 5t/ha and 10t/ha application? Why do they tell the bulk density is high (compared with what other soils?).

My recommendation is to revise the feedback form as suggested by me and send it back to the reviewers and see what their responses are, whether satisfied or not, and if they agree with what has been done, then don't send it back to me. Instead accept it. If the authors don't agree with what I have suggested (expand the discussion, in the current version, practically there is no discussion), then you better send the current version to another editor for his decision.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Velu Rasiah

Professor, Department of Environment and Resource Management, Australia

And

School of Science, Information Technology & Engineering, University of Ballarat, Australia