SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_50614**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Organic Fertilizers Effect on Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) Tuber Production in Sandy Loam Soil**
Type of the Article	**Original research paper**

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	**Organic fertilizer rate as mention in line 80-83 is not the same as in line 86-87. Confusing.** **Line 95-99: the unit "kg^{-1}" is confusing. Why the calculation does not based on 1 hectar?** **RESULT and DISCUSION:** **3.1 Morphological parameters ... the conten explainning agronomic parameter rather than morphology. So, 3.1 Agrnomical parameters** **Line 376: table 3: there is interaction fo tuber weight and yield. so that, presenting effect of individual factor is useless. It will be better if presenting in graph** **Line 395: table 4: the comment the same as in line 376 above. It will be better if presenting in graph** Line 422: fig 2: do you mean single tuber weight is the same as tuber weight per plant? If it's come from destructive sample, bar chart is more fix than line chart 1. **CONCLUSION: there is significant interaction in some parameters, and therefore the conclussion must be stated for each variety**	we corrected as suggested In line **86-87** **In line 95-99** **Sub heading 3.1** Line 422: fig 2> avarage single tuber weight/plat **But we think in Line 376: table 3 and Line 395: table 4 would be better to present in tabular form** **we adjusted the coclusion as you suggested**
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction: paragraph is too long. It wiil be better to divide into some paragraphs, in order to make easy to understand Line 67: potassium 0.15 meq100g .... the unit must be cmol kg^{-1} (international standart unit) Line 80-82: The treatments were: Factor A: Varieties .... should be come after sentence in line 77 Line 88-90: how much the content (%) in each fertilizer used ... for exp: TSP (....% P2O5) and etc Line 118: **2.7 Parameters measured** .... "Observation" is better	We addressed all the minor corrections except Line 88-90
Optional/General comments	Correlation analysis could be constructed to understand relationship between parameters	It would be better but we mentioned the interaction between parameters in table 3. So we are not interested to include the Correlation analysis.

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)*	**AUTHORS HAVE NO COMPETING INTERESTS EXIST**