ReviewForm1.7

JournalName:	**AsianJournalofSoilScienceandPlantNutrition**
ManuscriptNumber:	**Ms_AJSSPN_116338**
TitleoftheManuscript:	**Unveilingthe Ndynamics: Differenturea fertilizersandtheireffects onfodder maize inAlfisols**
Type oftheArticle	**OriginalResearchArticle**

ReviewForm1.7

PART 1:Review Comments

	Reviewer'scomment	**Author'scomment***(ifagreedwithreviewer,correct themanuscriptand highlightthatpartin the manuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshould write his/herfeedbackhere)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is themanuscriptimportantforscientificcommunity?** (Pleasewritefewsentencesonthismanuscript) **2. Is thetitleofthearticlesuitable?** (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle) **3. Is theabstract ofthearticlecomprehensive?** **4. Aresubsections and structureof themanuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you thinkthemanuscriptisscientificallycorrect?** **6. Arethereferencessufficientand recent? If you have suggestion ofadditionalreferences,pleasemention in the review form.** **(Apart fromabovementioned 6points,reviewersarefree toprovide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. Yes,thismanuscriptimportantforthescientificcommunity,particularlyforthose involvedinagricultural researchandnitrogenmanagement.Itaddressesacrucial aspect offertilizerapplication anditsimpacton nitrogen dynamics,specifically on foddermaizeinAlfisols. 2. Notreally.Caconsiderthefollowing"AssessingtheImpactofCoatedandPrilled UreaFertilizerson Nitrogen DynamicsandFodderMaize Yieldin Alfisols".This titlehighlightsthespecifictypesofureafertilizersexamined(coatedandprilled) andemphasizes thekeyoutcomes ofthestudy(nitrogendynamics andcropyield). 3. The abstractcould be better by including specific numerical data to quantify observed differencesin plantgrowth andyieldamong treatments.Also,itcould bettertoifthereisabriefdiscussionofpotentiallimitations,suchassamplesizeor experimentalconditionstoprovidecontextforthestudy'sfindings. 4. **Introduction**:Theintroductioneffectivelylaysouttheimportanceofnitrogenin agricultureandthechallenges associatedwithits efficientuse.However, thereare areas forimprovement. Firstly, thetransition between paragraphs could be smoothertoimproveoverallcoherence.Secondly, whileprevious studiesare referenced,addingspecificcitations tosupportassertions couldenhancecredibility. Lastly,thespecificobjectivesof thestudyandtheexpectedoutcomesarefound missing.**Materialsand Methods**:Thissectioneffectively outlinesthestudy's location,setupandprocedures.But,thereareareasforimprovement.Firstly,some steps in the experimental procedures, particularly the process for determining NH4+-NandNO3--N,couldbeclarifiedfurtherfor better understanding.Secondly, thereisnodiscussiononhow thecollecteddata wereanalyzed,whichcouldbe addressed bybrieflydescribingthestatisticalmethodsused.Lastly,thesection lacksmentionofpotentiallimitationsintheexperimentalprocedures,whichcould bebeneficialforprovidingcontexttotheresultsandconclusions. **Resultsand Discussion**:Thediscussion couldbe enhancedbyimprovingclarity and organization,providingspecific statisticalvaluesforsignificance,offeringmore extensivecomparisonswith existingliteratureandacknowledgingpotential limitations ofthestudy,suchas samplesizeandexperimentalconditions.Clarifying thestructureandpresenting theinformationinamore organizedmannerwould improvereadability,whileprovidingspecificstatisticalvalueswouldstrengthen the validity of reported differences between treatments. Also, bycomparing the findingswithabroaderrangeof previousstudieswouldeepentheanalysisand providemorecontext.**Conclusion**:Iteffectivelysummarizesthekey findingsand implicationsofthestudy.Italsohighlightsthesignificantdifferencesobservedin soilnutrientcontentbetweencoatedanduncoatedurea treatmentsovertime, emphasizingthebenefitsof controlled-releaseformulationsinsustainingplant nutrientuptakeandminimizingnitrogenlosses. 5. Yes. 6. No.Over95%ofthecitationsareoutdated.Requirereferencingmoreup-to-date sources.	

MinorREVISION comments **1. Islanguage/English qualityofthearticlesuitableforscholarly communications?**	Moderate	
Optional/Generalcomments		

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:	**Ewe Lay Sheng**
Department, University & Country	**The Energy University, Malaysia**