



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_39321
Title of the Manuscript:	Multivariate analysis of soil chemical attributes in the rotational system under levels of salinity and nitrogen
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	I read the MS titled "Multivariate analysis of soil chemical attributes in the rotational system under levels of salinity and nitrogen" with interest. The topic of the MS falls within the aims of the Journal. The experimental design is well done and the results are of interest. Very minor changes are necessary prior to be published. I suggest rewriting the title deleting the terms "Multivariate analysis". To me, they are not terms that characterize the manuscript. Line42-45. Delete what is in brackets. Not necessary is but in the M&M. Line 116. FTE? Write in full. Line 129. FTR. Write in full. Line 184. Yellow red argisol. Is the name of the soil used in your experiment? If yes, give it also in the M&M. Add the reference for the Soil system classification. Tab 5. C.O. and M.O. I think it was O.C. and O.M. (organic carbon and organic matter). Write always in the same manner. But most important, why they are in opposition (- and +). I think this is difficult to explain..... Line 240. A reference is necessary. Line 255. Dag? Line 321. CTC?	The authors agree with all the suggestions of the reviewer and have made the requested adjustments.
Optional/General comments		