

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102909
Title of the Manuscript:	Nitrogen management through nano urea and conventional urea and its effect on wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) growth and yield
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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community, in particular for soil and agriculture scientific communities. However, a little more in-depth review in discussion is highly recommended. The review would be better if mentioned also some other issues such as side effect of nitrogen as fertilizer.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive enough.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient and not recent. There are only 8 references of which only 1 (12.5%) is recent (published in the last five years). The addition of some recent references in different types of crop with different soil and climatic conditions might helpful to improve the quality of the review.</p> <p>Additional comments</p> <p>1. The references: The author AtaUl-Karim <i>et al.</i>, 2016 is found in paper but not on the list. On the contrary, Al-Juthery, H.W is found on the list but not in paper. Fix it.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	--	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iman Santosa
Department, University & Country	Indonesia