

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_IJECC_117736</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>INFLUENCE OF LIQUID NANO UREA FERTILIZER ON GROWTH OF SUMMER RICE (Oryza sativa L.) UNDER SOUTH GUJARAT CONDITIONS</b>
Type of the 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

## 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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript holds significant importance to the scientific community as it addresses the impact of nano urea on the growth of summer rice, a highly valued economic crop. The article underlines some recent scientific findings that may be beneficial to the agricultural community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable for the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract contains a comprehensive summary of the findings in this manuscript. However, the manuscript can be improved if the experimental groups details were written in a more concise manner.</p> <p>4. The subsection and the structure of the manuscript perfectly conveys the author's findings and is appropriate for scientific publishing.</p> <p>5. The manuscript contains enough data and information to back up its claims, thereby proving its scientific accuracy and reliability.</p> <p>6. The manuscript contains a wide range of references dating back to 1947 and are as recent as 2023, enough to cover commonly known information and recent advancements. However, the article contains a lack of citation and clarification in the second and third paragraph of the manuscript introduction. Additional references are needed to provide a stronger claim to the statements mentioned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some abbreviations require additional clarifications in the manuscript, such as RDN and DAT.</li> <li>- In the introduction, mentioning the protein and fat content of rice, should define fresh weight or dry weight.</li> <li>- Leaf area index was written incorrectly and was written as "Larea index" instead.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Impressive work on the amazing manuscript and scientific results. The investigation on nano urea was very interesting and unique, as the combination of the nanotechnology and agricultural field has not been widely explored yet. The article covers very important mechanism of nano urea, and I would love to see a more in-depth explanation on those topics. Overall, the manuscript featured comprehensive experimental design and discussion, leading to a very impressive conclusion!	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sunyapat Akkarajeerawat
Department, University & Country	Bangkok Christian College, Thailand