

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_128755
Title of the Manuscript:	Biopolymer Urea Composite for Enhancing Nitrogen Use Efficiency in Coastal Sandy Soils of Kerala
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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: 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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The progress in research highlighted the importance of Urea utilization and its associated environmental losses. It implies to work on novel technique and developing biopolymer urea is one of them. So, this research would be a significant contribution by the authors towards environment protection and future sustainability perspectives.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Authors can revisit to modify the title by adding N losses prevention to make it more catchy	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, Abstract is comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It has numerous weak points that must need to be address. 1) Authors need to clarify all the factors of this study in material and method section and where applicable. 2) Authors need to mention the results of preliminary research (for choosing 25% and 75% ratio) 3) Discussion is not appropriate. Authors need to do more discussion	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Authors are suggested to update and add following references relate to this study 1) <a href="#">Improving crop productivity and nitrogen use efficiency using sulfur and zinc-coated urea: A review</a> 2) <a href="#">Neem coated urea improves the productivity, nitrogen use efficiency and economic return of wheat crop.</a> 3) <a href="#">Sustainable Nitrogen Management in Sugarcane Production</a>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to address grammar mistakes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Authors are suggested to update reference with the above-given research papers relevant to the study	

### 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Talha Aslam
Department, University & Country	Jiangxi Agricultural University, China