

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97166
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nanoscale zinc oxide particles on macronutrient concentration of Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea 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.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)
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Yes No (Needs a significant improvement) Yes. Yes No. Needs more references to beb	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The English language need improvement. 2. The abstract is only a methodology based, and lack major findings and results. Need to be rewritten with summarized results. 3. The introduction is too short with few references. No aims and objectives defined. Needs rewriting. 4. The results are satisfactory. However, the discussion need to be rewritten.	
Optional/General comments	The article lacks very basic information in the introduction and discussion. The abstract is not very informative as it doesn't include the results and objectives of the study. A serious revision is recommended.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmad Ali
Department, University & Country	Huazhong Agricultural University, China