**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:


**PART 1: Review Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer's comment</th>
<th>Author's comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compulsory REVISION comments</strong></td>
<td>(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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The abstract should contain the purpose of the study, brief methodology and core findings of the study. You didn't state the purpose and the methodology you have used in brief.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is redundancy in the abstract part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Don't write abbreviation in key words.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some statements are not clear, please make them clear for the readers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How fertilizer recommendation could be with unlimited range, like &gt;250 kg/ha. It should be specific.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The number of soil samples and how the samples were collected should clearly be stated in the methodology part and the laboratory analysis result should be presented and interpreted in the result and discussion part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The result and discussion part is not well written.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How you did the fertility maps of the study areas should clearly explained in the methodology part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor REVISION comments**

**Optional/General comments**
### Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</td>
<td>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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