

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_124681
Title of the Manuscript:	FYM superimposed with inorganic fertilizer: enhanced wheat yield, and soil quality in degraded red Alfisol
Type of the Article	Research article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work done is of significant importance in view of declining soil health however the scientific results presented by author in the manuscript doesn't show any significant effect of different treatments on soil properties. Also, the study was only done for one season so it will be very difficult to justify the effect of different treatments on soil properties in only one season.	Okay
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Effect of FYM and inorganic fertilizers on growth, yield of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) and soil properties of red Alfisol	Noted
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No need to give treatment details in abstract. The results of soil properties may be included in abstract.	Done as suggested
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Author failed to properly justify the effect of different treatment combinations on soil properties especially on pH, organic carbon content and nitrogen as results are very contradictory and not explainable.	Done
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The materials and methods & results and discussion section are poorly written and need to be revised properly as per scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In material and methods clarity is required for amount of soil used per plot, whether it is 10 kg for all pots or 10 kg soil per pot.• Give the source of recommended dose of fertilizers (N,P & K) taken for wheat crop. Give the formulae use for calculation of doses of N, P and K from hectare to per pot in material and methods.• The amount of FYM considered for experiment was 5 and 10 t ha⁻¹. Is there already any recommendation for FYM in package of practices along with NPK fertilizers. If yes, then kindly specify it. Also give the exact amount of FYM applied per pot.• Kindly explain in detail the methods used for analysis of FYM sample. Also mention the various methods use for analysis of soil properties in material and methods.• pH of different treatments was non-significant, however, a very sharp decline in pH is observed as compared to initial status so give proper explanation for this. Also there is quite a difference in pH between different treatments, so need to check the statistical analysis again.• Despite adding FYM in treatments T4, T5 and T6 the organic carbon status is not increased however it increased in treatment T3 and T8 where no FYM is applied and in other treatments T7 where similar amount of FYM is applied. So these results are very contradictory and unacceptable.• Nitrogen content in all the treatments declined as compared to initial status. Even in the treatment where 1.5 times on N fertilizer is applied and also where higher dose of N along with FYM were applied. These results are very contradictory and authors failed to explain the reasons for the same.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	