

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104339
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Future of Agriculture through Nanotechnology- A Review
Type of the Article	Review

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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)
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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. This manuscript holds importance for the scientific community because it delves into the multifaceted implications and applications of nanotechnology in agriculture, providing a holistic view of its past, present, and future roles. 2. Yes 3. Yes, but abbreviations such as R and D should be defined before they are used in the abstract. Furthermore, symbols such as '&' should be replaced with 'and'. 4. The manuscript would be enhanced if it included tables, figures, and concept maps. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, but almost all of the sections are lacking in details. It would be ideal if it was backed up by some recent and relevant data. 6. The authors attempted to cite numerous references; however, some of the references are outdated. I recommend that they replace or remove old references (references written more than ten years ago).	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is passable, but it could be improved.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Belay Tafa Oba
Department, University & Country	Arba Minch University, Ethiopia