

### **Editor's Comment:**

I apologize for my delayed response. I have read the manuscript number 2020/AJSSPN/57612 again. First, where is the second round of revision with the reviewer's comments? I cannot find it. I have commented before some points (but, there are other problems into the manuscript) to justify my decision. I repeat my decision: The manuscript needs a major revision. When I write "a major revision", it means that the manuscript must be revised by the reviewer's again. For example, with the statistical analysis subsection provided into the material and methods, I tried to read the results and discussion section. To be honest, it is very confused. The authors present a lot of results without any tendency. They did not try to achieve their "aim" and why did they do that? Because the aim of this study is obscure. Even the discussion is weak, they try to use a lot of sequential references (e.g., ... These results are in agreement with reporters (Madhu, et al., 1993) (Amara, et al., 1995) (Patel, et al., 1996), (Panwar, et al., 2000) (El-Bakry, et al., 2001) (Bahadur et al. 2013) (Upadhyay and Vishwakarma 2014) (Ram et al. 2016) (Gawde et al. 2017) (Bhatt et al. 2017) (Bharti and Raj 2017) (Brar et al. 2015) (Patel et al. 2018), and **it is not a discussion**.

Below I re-write the author's comments. After reading it, I realize that they need experience when writing a scientific manuscript and especially a response to an editor or even a reviewer.

1. It has mentioned clearly, the purpose of the study related with, in ABSTRACT.

Editor response:

Yes, I read the sentence and it is not an aim. To be clear, the authors must RE-WRITE the sentence and clarify their aim. I truly recommend the following link: <https://researcheracademy.elsevier.com/writing-research/fundamentals-manuscript-preparation>. They will find and learn here how to write an aim correctly. Also, I hope they learn how to write an entire manuscript.

2. Yes, it has been removed from the ABSTRACT.

Editor response:

Thanks!

3. Yes, every abbreviations have been removed and written full name of expressions into text.

Editor response:

Better!

4. Yes, it has mentioned now in materials and methods.( The bread wheat cv. PBW-343 variety was used for its performance in the experimental research as a test crop through integrated nutrient management during rabi season 2018-19 and 2019-20 and effect on chemical-biological properties of soil).

Editor response:

Sorry, but it is not a hypothesis. Hypotheses must be written in the introduction section. Also, hypotheses must be supported by scientific data and when appropriated experimental results. Here: link: <https://researcheracademy.elsevier.com/writing-research/fundamentals-manuscript-preparation>. I hope you learn how and where to write a hypothesis in a scientific manuscript.

5. Yes, mistake have been corrected. It should be nitrogen levels in place of nutrient levels. And references related to nitrogen levels have quoted, in addition with earlier reference. Bahadur et al. (2013) (Tadesse et al. 2013) (Yaduvanshi et al. 2013) (Parewa et al. 2014) (Singh et al. 2014a) (Upadhyay

and Vishwakarma 2014) (Ram et al. 2016) (Gawde et al. 2017) (Bhatt et al. 2017) (Bharti and Raj 2017) (Brar et al. 2015) (Bhatt et al. 2016) (Akram et al. 2017) (Bhavani et al. 2017) (Patel et al. 2018).

Editor response:

I got it. But you must describe it into the material and methods section.

6. It has added in material and methods.

Editor response

Agreed.

7. Yes, comment is accepted, and It has added in material and methods.

**Editor's Details:**

Dr. Tancredo Souza  
Professor,  
Centre for Functional Ecology,  
University of Coimbra, Portugal.