

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121705
Title of the Manuscript:	Seed Germination and Subsequent Seedling Growth as Influenced by Silica Nanoparticles Invigoration in Soybean (<i>Glycine max</i> (L.) Merrill.)
Type of the Article	(Short) Original Research Article

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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is a short laboratory research that can serve as a benchmark for further studies and can be of practical use.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The information in the title is not fully detailed in the content of the article.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes. The abstract includes information from all sections of the paper, even information that is not later found in the content.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Both the Materials and methods as well as the Results and discussions are quite clearly presented, but very briefly. The production of nanoparticles and their characterization is totally ignored, not even the minimum information provided in the abstract about them is found. There are no discussions and no subchapter of Conclusions.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work is based on concrete results obtained from the field and statistically interpreted, but the results are little compared with others obtained and known. It requires broader discussions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No. The latest titles are from 2021. The bibliography could be improved in the context of more detailed discussions of the results obtained.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is a brief communication of some results, without being put in a broader context.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Codruța Mihaela Dobrescu
Department, University & Country	The National University of Science and Technology, Pitești University Centre, Romania