

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_108694
Title of the Manuscript:	THE SIGNIFICANCE OF NANOPARTICLES IN PLANT TOLERANCE TO ABIOTIC STRESS IN HORTICULTURE CROPS: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript lacks the essential qualities necessary for making a substantial contribution to the scientific community. Despite its categorization as a review, the content does not meet the basic criteria for even a mini review. The manuscript does not adhere to the author's guidelines, deviating significantly from what is expected based on its title. The structural and scientific deficiencies are glaring, encompassing issues such as incoherent statements, lack of depth in exploration, and absence of a comprehensive literature review. Furthermore, there is a notable absence of logical flow and interconnectedness between ideas, contributing to the overall lack of coherence. The chosen headlines do not effectively encapsulate the content. Additionally, the content lacks scientific accuracy, with statements that are not adequately explained or supported. In summary, the manuscript falls short in various aspects, including relevance, clarity, coherence, and scholarly rigor, making it unsuitable for meaningful engagement within the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title does not accurately reflect the content of the paper. A more suitable title for what the manuscript is intended to be could be: 'Nanoparticles and Abiotic Stress in Horticultural Crops' or 'Application of Nanotechnology to Alleviate Abiotic Stress in Horticultural Crops.' It is crucial for the title to precisely mirror the paper's content, which is not the case with the current title.</p> <p>3. The abstract is lacking in comprehensiveness and structure, doesn't effectively summarise the content of the manuscript</p> <p>4. They are very deficient and inappropriate.</p> <p>5. It lacks scientific correctness in some points and reveals a deficient knowledge of the theme, with a lack of relevant literature.</p> <p>6. Several references listed in the bibliography are not cited in the text. Although the authors have included a substantial number of recent references, it is not reflected in the quality of the manuscript. A comprehensive literature review, coupled with the appropriate and contextual presentation of information, is crucial to enhance the overall quality and purpose of the article.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is acceptable for scholarly communications, but significant improvements are required. There is a clear need to strengthen the connection and transitions between sentences. Headlines should be revised to reflect their content. Additionally, the citation content and context need substantial enhancement for scholarly standards.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jorge Fonseca Miguel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain</b>