



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_15921
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of soil micronutrients (Zinc and Boron) on yield and uptake of wheat in an acid soil of West Bengal, India
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is too general; the first sentence is almost the same as in the Introduction; some results, especially recommendations of the optimum B and Zn rates for enhancement of the yield 2. Within whole text and tables: decrease number of digits. For example, at line 22 replace 216.6 with 217 3. The Figure 1 is redundant, Table 2 is sufficient for description of the experimental design 4. Do not use capital letters for zinc, boron, urea, potassium, etc. within the sentence 5. Tables: present the mean values and standard deviations only and indicate the results of statistical analysis 6. Lines 203- 209: the relationships are weakly described, please, clarify in more details 7. Figure 5 is not necessary, table such as the tables 6 and 7 (with indicated significance of the coefficients) will be sufficient 8. Conclusions only repeat some already mentioned results. Please, add some recommendations for farther research and for real application if the investigated measures 	<p>1) The first sentence in the abstract and in the introduction is similar but not the same. This was done to provide the global importance of the study. In general, the opening sentence of abstract and introduction are very similar as the abstract is often produced independently than the paper and considered separate. We have provided some result in the abstract along with the recommendation on the application of B and Zn for the enhancement of the wheat production in the acid soil region of West Bengal.</p> <p>2) We have tried to reduce the number decimal digits and in some cases we have rounded the figure (specifically in the text). However, some cases (mainly in tables) to maintain the similar formatting, we had to keep the values in multiple decimal digits.</p> <p>3). We have deleted the figure 1 and kept the Table 2.</p> <p>4) We have modified this throughout the manuscript. We only used small letters for nutrients within a sentence.</p> <p>5) Mean values and standard deviations are provided in all tables. The result of statistical analysis is discussed in the text.</p> <p>6) We are sorry for this. We have modified the sentence structure to convey the</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>message easily and rightly.</p> <p>7) We think the figure 5 provides information separate from the information provided in the tables. The information in the tables is not sufficient to explain the result. Therefore, we keep the figure 5.</p> <p>8) Yes, the conclusion provides a quick summary of the outcome of this study. We have also added few lines on the implications and the recommendations. We have clearly mentioned how this result should be used in real application. We have also mentioned future line of work.</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change the title: Effect of soil zinc and boron contents on yield..... 2. Line 13: mention which nutrients were determined 3. Line 15: replace “build-up” with “enhancement” 4. Line 43: deficiencies 5. Line 101: a set of soil samples <u>was</u> collected 6. Lines 125 and 126: which specifications do you mean? Please, describe 7. Line 133: what does it mean @100 kg/ha? 8. Line 139: ...110 (maturity) DAS. 9. Line 153: replace Experimental methods with Analytical methods 10. Line 177: replace “spectrophotometer “ with “spectrometer” and add instrument type (producer) and briefly the measurement conditions 11. Lines 190-191: The significant differences should be specified in the tables 12. Table 3 (headings): add <u>yield</u> (t/ha) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1). Yes the title is modified. 2) Yes, we have mentioned the nutrients. 3). Yes, replaced. 4) Yes, corrected. 5) Yes, corrected. 6) ‘following the specifications mentioned in Table 1.’ We have clarified the sentence this way. 7) we have clarified this as ‘at the rate of’. 8) Corrected. 9) Thank you. It is replaced. 10) Yes, corrected. The model number and instrument type is added. We have added the conditions (wavelength) in the revised version of the manuscript. 11) We have provided the means and standard deviations in tables. We have discussed the significant defences in the text. 12) Yes added as ‘Grain Yield (t ha⁻¹)’
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript presents reasonable results documenting clearly beneficial synergistic effect of Zn and B in the area with deficient amount of these elements. However, some improvements are necessary before potential publication as mentioned above. Please, check the whole text carefully because many typing errors occur within the manuscript.	Thank you. We have checked the manuscript carefully for typos and other errors. We have modified the manuscript following the comments above and other reviewers. We appreciate your comments and suggestions.