

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_130561
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Level of Nano Urea on Yield, Quality and Shelf life of Strawberry (Fragaria X ananassa) cv. Winter Dawn, under Prayagraj Agro Climatic Condition
Type of the 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript highlights the level of nano urea input to improve strawberry yield. It then helps determine the quality of strawberries after applying variable doses of fertilizers. Finally, it helps determine the shelf life to avoid post-harvest losses.	Thanks for the comments
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	Ok
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.	First of all, I suggest the author to delete the first sentence of his abstract. Also, the second sentence should be moved after the objective of the study. The results are not very well presented and the conclusion is not present either. Finally, I find that some non-useful keywords can be deleted like RDN, urea and Winter Dawn	Thanks for the comments. Ok
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	There are sentence restructurings to be done to improve the scientific quality of this manuscript.	Ok thanks
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	Yes
Optional/General comments	I suggest the author review the presentation of the tables (see examples of articles published in the journal) and the font size of the captions.	Thanks for the comments. Noted and revised

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>	