

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102096
Title of the Manuscript:	"Influence of zinc and nano urea on growth and yield of maize (Zea mays L.)"
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think it is useful to optimize growth and yield of maize in the aspect of agricultural merit. 2. I think the title is appropriate. 3. I think the abstract is good enough to make the article comprehensive. 4. I think the subsections and manuscript structure are both good enough. 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. I think the references are sufficient and good enough. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think there are little problem in English. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authors give two useful Tables (i.e. Tables 1 for growth and Table 2 for yield). They provide readers so called dose-responses. One of my major points is about demonstrating the optimized condition, Zinc 30 kg/ha + Nano urea 4 mL/lt. I am wondering if authors did Zinc 40 kg/ha or Nano urea 5 mL/lt. Generally speaking, Zinc 40 kg/hr or Nano urea 5 mL/lt might inhibit growth and reduce yield. I think such data would be very useful. As I suppose additional experiments would be too hard, I would like the authors to add some speculation about it. 2. Another point is "nano urea". I know authors describe usefulness of "nano urea" in Introduction section. For example, good efficiency in nitrogen availability instead of nitrogen contamination in soil. I think these explanations are so useful, and therefore, it is very good as it is. I think that readers may get interested about chemistry of "nano urea". Is "nano urea" something like urea molecules contained in some nano-size particles? 	

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:	Shogo Ozawa
Department, University & Country	Iwate Medical University, Japan