

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJA_112590</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Evaluation of Nano Urea versus Conventional Urea for Nitrogen Management in Rainfed Sunflower (<i>Helianthus annuus</i>) Cultivation in Acid Sandy Loam Soils of Assam.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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><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>The manuscript is very important to the community because it highlights the issue that relate to the food crisis and the details in the sunflower growth. Aligning with several SDG elements.</p> <p>Clearly. However, please revised the proper name of the sunflower.</p> <p>No significant issue was highlighted. What is the motivation to assess the nitrogen management. The use of viz. should be avoided. The conditions in the experiment are not necessary. No recommendation and the relationship with the nitrogen management after the result obtained. Are the authors recommending the nano urea compared to the conventional fertilizer?</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Numbers of references are sufficient. But lack of recent sources.</p> <p>Additional Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Methodology section could be divided into 2; sub-sect external factors/conditions (preparation of field, fertilizer application, sowing of seed ....) and elements (result) obtained (seeds germination, ...).</li> <li>2. Please put numbers to the equations given. Give some explanation if possible.</li> <li>3. Some results were discussed clearly, but some lack of supporting data. Please be consistent.</li> <li>4. Please consider putting some figures in the manuscript.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Please proofread the manuscript. Some incomplete sentences could be found.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Please refer to the manuscript.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Norazlina Ahmad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mersing Polytechnic, Malaysia</b>