For research article

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files.

2. Questions for General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Can be improved	
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	Yes	
Is the research design appropriate?	Yes	
Are the methods adequately described?	Can be improved	
Are the results clearly presented?	Yes	
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	Yes	

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: Authors did not make a research hypothesis

Response 1: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, by rewriting the last paragraph of the introduction, we have clearly stated the research hypothesis and expected results.

Comments 2: Keywords: they cannot be this same as in title.

Response 2: Agree.We have, accordingly, changed some keywords.

Comments 3: MM section, statistic analysis: Have all the criteria been met for AVOVA to be used? equality of variances, normality of distribution?

Response 3: We conducted tests for homogeneity of variances and normality of the experimental data for ANOVA analysis, and the data met the assumptions.

Comments 4: MM section: there is no any information about PCA procedure or correlation coefficients, but authors present results of these analysis.?

Response 4: Agree.We have, accordingly, added the description of correlation and principal component analysis in the MM section.

Comments 5: I suggest to used literature about nitrogen fertilization listed below:

Response 5: Agree.We have, accordingly, added the relevant references in the Discussion section.

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

Point 1:

Response 1:

5. Additional clarifications

For review article

Response to Reviewer X Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files. *[This is only a recommended summary. Please feel free to adjust it. We do suggest maintaining a neutral tone and thanking the reviewers for their contribution although the*

comments may be negative or off-target. If you disagree with the reviewer's comments please include any concerns you may have in the letter to the Academic Editor.]

2. Questions for General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Is the work a significant contribution to the field?		*[Please give your response if necessary. Or you can also give your corresponding response in the point-by-point response letter. The same as below]*
Is the work well organized and comprehensively described?		
Is the work scientifically sound and not misleading?		
Are there appropriate and adequate references to related and previous work?		
Is the English used correct and readable?		

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: *[Paste the full reviewer comment here.]*

Response 1: *[Type your response here and mark your revisions in red]* Thank you for pointing this out. I/We agree with this comment. Therefore, I/we have….*[Explain what change you have made. Mention exactly where in the revised manuscript this change can be found – page number, paragraph, and line.]*

"[updated text in the manuscript if necessary]"

Comments 2: *[Paste the full reviewer comment here.]*

Response 2: Agree. I/We have, accordingly, done/revised/changed/modified…..to emphasize this point. *Discuss the changes made, providing the necessary explanation/clarification. Mention exactly where in the revised manuscript this change can be found – page number, paragraph, and line.]*

"[updated text in the manuscript if necessary]"

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

Point 1:

Response 1: (in red)

5. Additional clarifications

[Here, mention any other clarifications you would like to provide to the journal editor/reviewer.]