Date: 19 Dec 2022
To: "Brian Joseph Bohman" bohm0072@umn.edu
From: "Pirjo Peltonen-Sainio" pirjo.peltonen-sainio@luke.fi
Subject: EURAGR11860R1

Ref.: Ms. No. EURAGR11860R1
Quantifying critical N dilution curves across G × E × M effects for potato using a partially-pooled Bayesian hierarchical method
European Journal of Agronomy

Dear Dr. Bohman,

I can now inform you that the Editorial Board has evaluated the manuscript EURAGR11860R1: Quantifying critical N dilution curves across G × E × M effects for potato using a partially-pooled Bayesian hierarchical method.

Please submit your revision at latest by
20 Jan 2023

I am pleased to inform you that it has been favourably received. The Editor has advised that the manuscript will be acceptable subject to satisfactory minor revision.

The comments below should be taken into account when revising the manuscript. Along with your revised manuscript, you will need to supply a covering letter in which you list all the changes you have made to the manuscript, and in which you detail your responses to all the comments passed by the reviewer(s) and Editor. Should you disagree with any comment(s), please explain why.

To submit a revision, please visit https://www.editorialmanager.com/euragr/ and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item called Submission Needing Revision. The revised manuscript and covering letter can be submitted there.

To speed up the production process, I would like to ask you to upload all source files separately. Figures should be uploaded per number. For example, figures 1, 2a+b and 3 should be uploaded as 3 separate files.

NOTE: Upon submitting your revised manuscript, please upload the source files for your article. For additional details regarding acceptable file formats, please refer to the Guide for Authors at: http://www.elsevier.com/journals/european-journal-of-agronomy/1161-0301/guide-for-authors

When submitting your revised paper, we ask that you include the following items:

Manuscript and Figure Source Files (mandatory)

We cannot accommodate PDF manuscript files for production purposes. We also ask that when submitting your revision you follow the journal formatting guidelines. Figures and tables may be embedded within the source file for the submission as long as they are of sufficient resolution for Production. For any figure that cannot be embedded within the source file (such as *.PSD Photoshop files), the original figure needs to be uploaded separately. Refer to the Guide for Authors for additional information.
http://www.elsevier.com/journals/european-journal-of-agronomy/1161-0301/guide-for-authors

Highlights (mandatory)

Highlights consist of a short collection of bullet points that convey the core findings of the article and should be submitted in a separate file in the online submission system. Please use 'Highlights' in the file name and include 3 to 5 bullet points (maximum 85 characters, including spaces, per bullet point). See the following website for more information
http://www.elsevier.com/highlights

Graphical Abstract (optional)

Graphical Abstracts should summarize the contents of the article in a concise, pictorial form designed to capture the attention of a wide readership online. Refer to the following website for more information: http://www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts

Include interactive data visualizations in your publication and let your readers interact and engage more closely with your research. Follow the instructions here: https://www.elsevier.com/authors/author-services/data-visualization to find out about available data visualization options and how to include them with your article.

Research Elements (optional)
This journal encourages you to share research objects - including your raw data, methods, protocols, software, hardware and more – which support your original research article in a Research Elements journal. Research Elements are open access, multidisciplinary, peer-reviewed journals which make the objects associated with your research more discoverable, trustworthy and promote replicability and reproducibility. As open access journals, there may be an Article Publishing Charge if your paper is accepted for publication. Find out more about the Research Elements journals at https://www.elsevier.com/authors/tools-and-resources/research-elements-journals?dgcid=ec_em_research_elements_email.

Kind regards,

Pirjo Peltonen-Sainio, Ph.D.
Editor In Chief
European Journal of Agronomy

Important note: If a reviewer has provided a review or other materials as attachments, those items will not be in this letter. Please ensure therefore that you log on to the journal site and check if any attachments have been provided.

Note: While submitting the revised manuscript, please double check the author names provided in the submission so that authorship related changes are made in the revision stage. If your manuscript is accepted, any authorship change will involve approval from co-authors and respective editor handling the submission and this may cause a significant delay in publishing your manuscript.

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer's Responses to Questions

Note: In order to effectively convey your recommendations for improvement to the author(s), and help editors make well-informed and efficient decisions, we ask you to answer the following specific questions about the manuscript and provide additional suggestions where appropriate.

1. Are the objectives and the rationale of the study clearly stated?

Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the clarity of the objectives and rationale of the study. Please number each suggestion so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: YES

Reviewer #2: Yes

---

2. If applicable, is the application/theory/method/study reported in sufficient detail to allow for its replicability and/or reproducibility?

Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the replicability/reproducibility of their study. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Mark as appropriate with an X:
Yes [x] No [] N/A []
Provide further comments here:

Reviewer #2: Mark as appropriate with an X:
Yes [] No [] N/A []
Provide further comments here:

---

3. If applicable, are statistical analyses, controls, sampling mechanism, and statistical reporting (e.g., P-values, CIs, effect sizes) appropriate and well described?

Please clearly indicate if the manuscript requires additional peer review by a statistician. Kindly provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the statistical analyses, controls, sampling mechanism, or statistical reporting. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Mark as appropriate with an X:
Yes [x] No [] N/A []
Provide further comments here:

Reviewer #2: Mark as appropriate with an X:
Yes [X] No [] N/A []
Provide further comments here:

---

4. Could the manuscript benefit from additional tables or figures, or from improving or removing (some of the) existing ones?

Please provide specific suggestions for improvements, removals, or additions of figures or tables. Please number each suggestion so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: YES, I think that it should be important to test if the N dilution curve for potatoes is monophasic or bi-phasic....according to "only vegetative" and "vegetative+tuber" development as I suggested in my previous reviewing. This test should be realized in the discussion paragraph in order to know if part of uncertainty of the "mono-phasic" dilution model could be explain by variations in the phenology of cultivars?

Reviewer #2: No

---

5. If applicable, are the interpretation of results and study conclusions supported by the data?

Please provide suggestions (if needed) to the author(s) on how to improve, tone down, or expand the study interpretations/conclusions. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: Mark as appropriate with an X:
Yes [] No [] N/A [x]
Provide further comments here:

See above remarks

Reviewer #2: Mark as appropriate with an X:
Yes [X] No [] N/A []
Provide further comments here:

---

6. Have the authors clearly emphasized the strengths of their study/theory/methods/argument?

Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to better emphasize the strengths of their study. Please number each suggestion so that the author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: YES

Reviewer #2: Yes

---

7. Have the authors clearly stated the limitations of their study/theory/methods/argument?

Please list the limitations that the author(s) need to add or emphasize. Please number each limitation so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: See above remarks

Reviewer #2: Yes

---

8. Does the manuscript structure, flow or writing need improving (e.g., the addition of subheadings, shortening of text, reorganization of sections, or moving details from one section to another)?

Please provide suggestions to the author(s) on how to improve the manuscript structure and flow. Please number each suggestion so that author(s) can more easily respond.

Reviewer #1: NO

Reviewer #2: No

---

9. Could the manuscript benefit from language editing?

Reviewer #1: No

Reviewer #2: No

Reviewer #1:

Authors have made a great effort for improving their manuscripts. I observe that they have more particularly improved the statistical analysis. They have also tried to take into account of my own suggestion for formulating the hypothesis that a part of the "uncertainty" in the mono-phasic N dilution curve could be due to the fact that the true model would be bi-phasic? Authors have mentioned clearly this hypothesis... BUT they did not try to go further...! I think that without any more modification in their manuscript, authors should try to provide in "suplemental material" a log-log graph showing if yes or not the log%N-logBiomass is mono-phasic or bi-phasic? This information is important for discussing the "Genotype-Environment".... Perhaps the difference in the slopes (b1 vs b2) is low or undetectable and then the mono-phasic model is a good approximation.... or perhaps this difference is high enough and then it could lead to high uncertainty?

My own opinion is that the paper could be accepted in its present form, but that it would be a pity to not include this more fundamental aspect in the discussion of such a paper.

Reviewer #2: Authors addressed all suggested changes in the manuscript; I appreciate that the authors considered my comments. From my perspective the manuscript did improved considerably, and I recommend it to be accepted for publication.

#AU_EURAGR#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code