Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_116371**
Title of the Manuscript:	**FERTILIZER NOVELTY: INVESTIGATING THE ROLE OF DIFFERENT UREA TYPES IN MINIMIZING LEACHING LOSS TO MAXIMIZING ITS USE EFFICIENCY**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)** **Other issues observed**	**Yes.** The findings if revised will contribute to the ongoing efforts in agricultural research to develop sustainable practices and technologies for efficient nutrient management. The manuscript provides valuable insights into the role of different urea types in minimizing leaching loss and maximizing nitrogen use efficiency, which is crucial for sustainable agriculture. It offers practical solutions to enhance nitrogen management, making it relevant for the scientific community **No.** The title effectively captures the essence of the study. However, a more concise alternative could be "Enhancing Nitrogen Use Efficiency Through Coated Urea Fertilizers or **the role of urea types in to maximizing its use efficiency.** **No**. Though the abstract succinctly summarizes the stud, key findings, and implications, providing a clear overview for readers, the objectives and methods are missing. **Yes**. The subsections and overall structure are well-organized, facilitating easy navigation and understanding of the study. **Yes**. The manuscript appears scientifically sound, however, it needs to be supported by detailed methodology and appropriate analysis and interpretations of the results. **Yes**. The references provided are relevant and support the study findings. However, consider adding recent literature on nitrogen management and coated urea technologies to enhance the breadth of the literature review especially when you are expand your discussions and in detailing the methodology.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments	**General comments/ suggestions** 1. The language and English quality meet the standards for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical or typographical errors may need correction. 2. Consider making the title more concise or clearer if possible. 3. 'The importance of understanding the consequences of climate change on tropical	

	rainforests has garnered increasing attention in recent years" in the introduction can be structured as "There is growing awareness of the significance of comprehending the ramifications of climate change on tropical rainforests in recent years." 4. Authors should improve the language and English quality of the manuscript to suit scholarly communication. This may involve correcting any grammatical or typographical errors in the manuscript. 5. The problem statement and objective are not well stated; therefore, authors should clearly state the problem statement and objectives. 6. Methodology: the methodology should be detailed to enhance reproducibility of the experiment by an independent or other researchers. 7. For example, details of how soil cores were collected, and prepared for laboratory analysis should be explicit. How these soil properties were determined using standard procedures should be included. 8. If the focus of the paper is coated and uncoated, we expect the various ureas to be subjected to same treatments eg urea coated should be compared with urea uncoated, prill urea coated should be compared with uncoated prill urea, etc. This will allow farmers to make an informed choices based on the behaviours of the urea fertilizers applied in the soil. So, therefore suggest, author to look at that seriously. 9. Authors should also let readers know whether there is a significant difference in the observed differences within treatment. That is whether the observed difference for leachates for Day 0, 5, 10, 15 etc are significantly different or not. His is also very important as it will let farmer know the implications of this. 10. Conclusions: 11. Authors: Uncoated urea fertilizers exhibited higher initial leachate nitrogen content compared to coated urea formulations, indicating a faster release of nitrogen from uncoated urea. 12. This conclusion will only be valid if author(s) conduct within treatment test to ascertain whether the differences in losses or emissions are different among 5th, 10th, 15th etc days. This aspect of the analyses is lacking. **NB:** Reviewer has also made some suggestions on the manuscript indicating the required revisions in the comment section. In conclusion the manuscript is marked **Major Revision: (>7-8)** can be published subject to revisions suggested. Again, the manuscript has not been subjected to plagiarism checks and editor could do so. I encourage authors to revise the manuscript accordingly so that the results can be published to enrich the scientific community Thank you	

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:	**Thomas Abindaw**
Department, University & Country	**University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana**