SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_41533**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EFFECT OF INTEGRATED NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT ON SOIL FERTILITY AND PRODUCTIVITY ON WHEAT CROP**
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	• Let me state that the research itself is fine but materials and methods, results, discussion part of this paper is very poorly described. • The abstract should be rewrite because it is not clear and grammatical editing required. • Please describe the treatments details and methodology in briefly in abstract, so anyone can understand the study based on abstract. • Line no. 2 please remove the 'if 'word. Use full treatment name in abstract part instead of T1 and T2. • line -14- Don't write again and again years name, write once further it will understood. • Format should be uniform, write either % or percentage • Line 32- your mentioned more than one country name in the text so please mentioned…/countries • Please mentioned first time full name integrated nutrient management thereafter you can write in short. • Line no 59 in write P2O5 instead of P2 (0)5 this is zero. • What basis of organic manure (Vermicompost, FYM and pressmud etc) applied? or whether it was applied on nitrogen content or dry weight basis? . Please describe the details of nutrient composition in different organic manures. • Kumar et al., 1999 is missing in references. • Singh et al., 2001 or Singh and Singh 2001 check it properly? • line150 correct the spelling of ratio or ration • Now there is Indian rupee symbol is available, so please insert the rupee symbol instead of Rs. • Some letters are in lowercase or uppercase or capital or small letters between the sentences. Please recheck the text properly for the worthiness of manuscript. • References should be according journal style; all the reference should be uniform. • Some recently published references should be include in the manuscript to support the results and discussion part of the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. It is not clear that results are given in the manuscript; there is very little variations since the experiment was carried out in two years, hence there were lot of variations in weather data. 2. Data interpretation and justification is very poor, 3. Results should be in highly structured and understandable to the readers 4. Tables were explained in result section, some minor modification is needed and grammatical mistake need to be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	1. English grammar and punctuation is poor throughout the manuscript which would require someone well versed in technical writing to edit. The study and accompanying results have merit but major revisions are needed to make this manuscript worthy of publication,	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Bharat Prakash Meena***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Soil Chemistry and Fertility, Indian Institute of Soil Science, India***