



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. Field experiment should be conducted in multiple cropping seasons and/or multiple locations to keep the reproducibility of results obtained in field experiments of soybean.</p> <p>2. There is possibly difference of response to sulfur sources and levels among soybean varieties (genotypes).</p> <p>You had better assess multiple number of soybean varieties. You should indicate data on GxE and discuss the most suitable genotype for better response to sulfur and increased yielding capacity.</p> <p>3. All the data obtained in multiple years, locations and varieties are statistically analyzed (ANOVA).</p> <p>4. Although the results can be applied to farmers of soybean, scientific and academic levels of this study is very primitive.</p> <p>5. Style of the manuscript should be modified by adding abstract to the manuscript and combing "Results and Discussion" with "Conclusion". Discussion is so poor that it should be improved using recent publications.</p> <p>6. Data shown Table 1 are completely same as data shown in Fig. 1- Fig.6 which can be deleted.</p> <p>7. References cited in the manuscript are too old. Recent publications should be involved.</p> <p>8. Finally, I conclude that this manuscript cannot be accepted for the publication in the journal, ACRI.</p>	<p>I have used the most suitable genotype for better response to sulfur and increased yielding capacity.</p> <p>Yes , it was statistically analyzed (ANOVA)</p> <p>The study is not so primitive still can be applied to famers of soybean and scientific and academic levels.</p> <p>Yes , I agree with you.</p> <p>It is actually same but I wanted to elaborate it more using graph .</p> <p>Okay</p> <p>Kindly , accept the manuscript , we authors have worked hard for this manuscript . It will very kind of you if the manuscript gets published.</p>