SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJSSPN_35141**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of non-classic nitrogen fertilizer forms on some soil chemical properties, growth, yield of zucchini plants and emission of GHGs**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The manuscript needs English improvement and has many incomprehensible sentences. For example, in the first paragraph of the introduction sentences such as "but also can be cultivated in summer season, as it is rich in nutrients and bioactive compounds" or "It needs for N, as an essential nutrient, to give vigor growth and better yield, especially in the physiological stages" are unintelligible. Many sentences need to be improved, for example: Line 44 - required obtaining; Line 48 - is a low cost material contains various; Line 50/51 - humic acid is not a fertilizer as it does not directly provide nutrients to plants; Line 104. What is Fed? What is the N application per hectare? Lines 122-124; Line 168 – first one; may be due; Lines 169-171. Lines 172-173 "the chemically available concentration that comes from applying N mineral fertilizer was lower than come from the non-classic forms of the applied other fertilizers" This is not understandable. Line 177 "went hand by hand" is vague. Line 180 include after harvest Line 183-185 correlation coefficient …have the most effect. This needs clarification. Lines 193-195 should be discussed. Line 203 "the highest significant values" needs to be more specific. Line 210-211. The sentence needs improvement. Lines 214-215 "This result agreed with those obtained	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	by Sadak et al. (2015) on faba bean" How does it agree? Line 216. Do not use "it may be due to that" Lines 217-218 are vague. Give examples and insert references. Line 229 "the difference between total fruits fresh and dry weights" – This is water content Lines 242-249 could be moved to the introduction because is not a result or discussion of results. Line 250 "types more increased with applying" needs English improvement. Lines 255-257. Needs improvement. Lines 268-269. Needs improvement.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Luís Miguel Brito***
Department, University & Country	***Escola Superior Agrária, Instituto Politécnico de Viana do Castelo, Portugal***