

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJRCS_117622
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study of Prilled Urea and Urea Super Granule on Growth and Yield of Boro Rice
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/editorial-policy>)

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. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the comparative performance of prilled urea and urea super granule on rice growth, yield, and nitrogen uptake. The findings, particularly the recommendation of treatment T6 (USG at 7 DAT) for improving rice production while reducing nitrogen losses and conserving the environment, can significantly contribute to sustainable agriculture practices.</p> <p>2. YES</p> <p>3. OK The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the article. It includes the purpose of the experiment, the methodology, the main findings, and the conclusion.</p> <p>4. YES the manuscript appropriate</p> <p>5. ok Based on the information provided in the abstract, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The experiment was conducted using a randomized complete block design with appropriate replication. The treatments were well defined, and the results were analyzed statistically. The findings are supported by the data presented, and the conclusions drawn are based on the results obtained from the experiment. Therefore, it seems that the manuscript adheres to scientific principles and methodology. However, a full assessment of scientific correctness would require a detailed review of the entire manuscript, including the methods, results, and discussion sections.</p> <p>6. ok no of references try to include the latest reference papers so that result will some more accurate.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some more improvements in grammerly changes to be made.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	D Jayanarayana Reddy
Department, University & Country	G Pullaiah College of Engineering and Technology(Autonomus), India