

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_120330
Title of the Manuscript:	STRATEGIES TO ENHANCE THE EFFICIENCY OF PHOSPHATE FERTILIZERS
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The review works attention to detail and relevance make it a valuable contribution to sustainable agricultural practices. This work is of significant importance to the scientific community. It addresses the critical issue of phosphorus use efficiency in agriculture, which a key factor in sustainable crop production. The detailed analysis of various advanced-efficiency fertilizers and technologies provides valuable insights that can guide future research and development in soil fertility management. I particularly appreciate the manuscript's practical approach, combining theoretical concepts with real-world applications, which can greatly benefit both researchers and practitioners in the field.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Strategies to Enhance the Efficiency of Phosphate Fertilizers" is clear and descriptive, effectively conveying the main focus of the manuscript</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is complete and provides a clear overview of the key points discussed in the manuscript. It is highlighting the importance of P in crop growth, the challenges of P fixation in soils, and the various new strategies developed to improve the phosphorus use efficiency.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are well-organized and appropriate. Each section covers a specific aspect of phosphorus efficiency enhancement.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is providing detailed explanations of the various strategies to improve phosphorus use efficiency. It carefully reviews existing literature, providing accurate and relevant data to support its claims. The discussion of innovative fertilizers and technologies is backed by scientific studies and practical examples, demonstrating their effectiveness. Additionally, the manuscript considers both the theoretical and practical aspects of phosphorus management, making its conclusions well-founded and reliable.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are both sufficient and recent, covering a wide range of relevant studies and sources that support the discussion on P use efficiency and innovative fertilizer technologies. The majority of the cited works are from the last decade, ensuring that the information is up-to-date and reflective of current research trends in the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written, with clear and precise language that effectively communicates complex scientific concepts. The technical terms are used appropriately, and the explanations are detailed and coherent. Conduct a thorough proofreading to correct any minor grammatical errors or typographical mistakes. Ensure consistent use of technical terms and avoid unnecessary jargon; like in one section, the authors refer to "enhanced-efficiency fertilizers" and in another section, authors call them "improved fertilizers.", using "P fixation" in one paragraph and "phosphorus immobilization" in another, without clarifying they mean the same thing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides an extensive review of existing literature, offering a solid foundation for understanding the current state of phosphate fertilizer efficiency. The organization of the paper into distinct sections, each focusing on different aspects of phosphorus efficiency, makes it easy to follow and understand. Ensuring consistent use of technical terms and simplifying complex sentences would improve readability and coherence. Avoiding unnecessary jargon would make the paper accessible to a broader audience.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prasad P.
Department, University & Country	Srinivas Institute of Technology, India