

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_115853
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of Nano Urea and Urea Foliar Sprays on Nutrient Uptake and Soil Fertility in Fodder Maize (Zea mays L.) Production
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The topic/or the issue of the manuscript is very important. It is a contemporary and sensitive environmental issue. It provides feedback and knowledge in the field of soil fertility management and fertilizer application. So, the manuscript is generally essential for scientific community through gap filling/or suggesting further study in the field.</li> <li>The title of the article is sound. But, I recommend to reshuffle the title as “<b>Application of Nano Urea and Urea Foliar Sprays on Nutrient Uptake and Soil Fertility in Fodder Maize (Zea mays L.) Production</b>”. But it is not obligatory.</li> <li>The Abstract is very shallow. It requires medium modification (start with problem statement)</li> <li>It requires medium modification. The structure and subsections of the manuscript is not well structured. The methodology part should be restructured to clearly define the study area (biophysical and socio-economic situations), data sources, data collection methods, sampling design and sampling methods, data analysis methods (both experimental and statistical data analysis methods). The result discussion part also the topics and subtopics should be organized based on objectives sequentially instead of writing as <b>3.2 Nutrient up take- Varied levels of recommended dose -</b></li> <li>I think that the article requires series modification. It lacks supporting the research based on empirical evidences with appropriate citation. <b>Introduction part-</b> lacks empirical evidences with appropriate citation, the problem statement is not clearly defined with compared to other researches previously conducted in the field of soil fertility. But the author/s only cite and refer only 2 references in this section. <b>Methodology part-</b> (see comments on number 4) <b>Result section-</b> lacks discussion of results with other findings. The author/s tried to discuss but it is not enough for discussion. <b>Conclusion- is very shallow.</b> . So, it requires some modification to be scientific paper.</li> <li>The reference and in cite citation is not well written. References are not sufficient and most references aren't recent articles. Most paragraphs of the main body are not properly cited. So, I suggest that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Best to use sufficient and recent references.</li> <li>Use consistent reference and in cite citation format (based on journal article).</li> <li>All the ideas should be properly cited.</li> <li>The reference list should provide full information of the article or book etc. For example, (Gomez--- and Jackson----</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The manuscript requires professional English language editing to enhance its readability.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The author/s focused on the <b>comparative evaluation of Nano Urea and Urea Foliar Sprays on Nutrient Uptake and Soil Fertility in Fodder Maize (Zea mays L.) Production</b>. The issue is sensitive and provides/expands knowledge in the field. However, I am not satisfied with content organization, introductory section, result and discussion as well as conclusion part, and references used and the ways of incite citation. The reference and incite citation should be totally modified. By saying this, I accept the article with serious modification.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayalneh Yedem Fentie
Department, University & Country	Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia