

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_112590
Title of the Manuscript:	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.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1: The study appears to be valuable for the scientific community. The comparison between nano urea and conventional urea in nitrogen management for rainfed sunflower cultivation addresses a practical and relevant agricultural concern. Assessing the efficacy of these different nitrogen sources in the context of acid sandy loam soils of Assam contributes valuable insights that can inform sustainable farming practices.</p> <p>2: The title is well-constructed and does not contain any evident errors or incorrect words.</p> <p>3: The abstract concludes with a summary of the best-performing treatment in terms of benefit to cost ratio. Overall, it offers a detailed snapshot of the study's objectives, methods, and key findings.</p> <p>4: the subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate as they cover key aspects such as experimental design, nitrogen management treatments, and results related to various growth and yield parameters.</p> <p>5: Yes</p> <p>6: The authors need to format the references and citations in the paragraph according to the guidelines of a journal format.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. However, some minor revisions may be required.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into nitrogen management in rainfed sunflower cultivation, specifically comparing the effectiveness of nano urea and conventional urea. The study's detailed experimental design, including ten different treatments, contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the subject. The results highlight important aspects such as seedling emergence, plant height, leaf characteristics, chlorophyll content, and various yield attributes. The thorough analysis and comparison of these parameters offer practical implications for optimizing sunflower cultivation under specific agro-climatic conditions. Overall, the manuscript serves as a valuable contribution to the scientific community interested in sustainable agricultural practices.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Siraj Khan
Department, University & Country	Qarshi University, Pakistan