

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_120850</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Efficacy of nano-urea on nitrogen-use efficiency of irrigated maize under temperate ecology</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Articles</b>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article provides important information regarding the efficacy of nano-urea on nitrogen-use efficiency of irrigated maize under temperate ecology.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is adequate to the content of the article.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is well written, adequately explains the research setting and issues.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The introduction provides an adequate description of the problem addressed and demonstrates the significance of the research problem. However, it is limited in its scientific scope. The methodology used is appropriate to the purpose of the research but could be restructured to enhance its scientific rigour. The results are interesting and important to researchers in relevant fields of agriculture.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript presents some issues of scientific accuracy that require further attention. For instance, the research methodology is not sufficiently detailed, which hinders an assessment of the study's rigour and reproducibility. Additionally, the data analysis appears incomplete and lacks sufficient statistical evidence, potentially affecting the validity of the conclusions. Furthermore, the literature cited is limited and does not reflect the most recent research in the field, which reduces the manuscript's relevance and theoretical context.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The number of references is limited and some corrections need to be made. I recommend the inclusion of a larger number of more recent studies on the subject and their insertion in bibliographic references;	
Minor REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I recommend a carefully check of the full manuscript to correct any grammatical or syntax error.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Please, take into account the following recommendations to improve this manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The general presentation of the manuscript should be reviewed, the extra spaces between words or the lack of spaces between titles, subtitles, tables, figures and text according to the requirements of the journal;</li> <li>- I recommend a revision of the manuscript according to the requirements of the journal (English, technical editing, bibliography, etc.);</li> <li>- I recommend a critical approach to the literature to enable analysis and interpretation of the information, development of an objective viewpoint and the setting of clear objectives;</li> <li>- It is recommended that Tables (see tables 3, 4, 7, 9) be edited in accordance with the formatting guidelines set forth by the journal. The table should be formatted on a single page, with the title positioned above the table;</li> <li>- It is recommended that figures (see figure 5) be uniformly edited in accordance with the specifications outlined in the log, particularly with regard to font;</li> <li>- The presentation of the results from this study lacks clarity and coherence, and there is a lack of clear reference to other studies with similar results. It is therefore recommended that this issue be subjected to a review;</li> <li>- I recommend that conclusions be formulated highlighting the importance of the results obtained;</li> <li>- I recommend including more recent bibliographic references.</li> </ul> <p><b>I recommend that the experiments presented in this manuscript be carried out for a minimum of 3 years and that clear recommendations then be formulated regarding the efficacy of nano-urea on nitrogen-use efficiency of irrigated maize under temperate ecology.</b></p> <p>Based on the above mentioned, I recommend this paper for publication after performing the suggested corrections.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Daniela Stoin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Life Sciences "King Michael I" from Timisoara, Romania</b>