**Review, Dr. Jacob Bushong.**

After reviewing the paper by Schepers and Holland, I have a hard time really figuring out what their point is in the paper. They begin by casting stones at the authors of the Raun et al. (2011) paper for using long-term fertilizer trial data from plots that have received treatments for as many as 40 years, but then present findings from another long-term fertility trial to argue their point. One of the biggest issues I see with the paper is it almost looks as if the authors have ‘cherry-picked’ the years from their long-term that fit the concept they are trying to convey. Why did they not present all the years of data from that long-term trial, instead of just picking 2002-04, and using only one year of data to support their sufficiency index claim? There were a few times in the paper I felt the authors contradicted their own argument by saying that yield or yield potential is not important and does not need to be included in the N recommendation, but then they turn around and say grain yields have the potential to vary by 25 percent or more because of weather conditions. The authors lost me in their argument that the sufficiency concept could be applied to N. Bray’s mobility concept is a fundamental concept to soil fertility and I though well accepted, but I guess not.

The only part of this article that I have a tendency to agree with is, are long-term fertility trials good sources of information for creating N recommendation algorithms? I see the authors point in that the check plots are not going to represent what would actually be seen in a farmer’s field and we do have data that support that organic C is not the same in these N fertilizer treatments that have received the same N rates year after year. I think having regional N rate trials allow us to validate our algorithms year after year or go back and use this data to tweak the algorithms if needed.