

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_118490
Title of the Manuscript:	Revolutionizing Agriculture with Nanotechnology: Advances, Applications, and Sustainability Considerations
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, The issues discussed in the manuscript are important for scientific community. The author discussed the advances in nanotechnology and its applications in agriculture. These are very important and demand scientific research.</p> <p>Partially, Though the author discuss some advances and applications of nanotechnology in agriculture, discussion on sustainability considerations of nanotechnology is hugely missing.</p> <p>No, the paper does not follow scientific research approach. Also, these subsections are not well organised. The paper looks more like a blog. For instance, the objective, research method, literature (conceptual, theoretical and empirical) is not well written or virtually omitted.</p> <p>No, The manuscript would have be ok if it follow scientific method. There should well written introduction that shows what the author wants to discussed, its rationales and likely contributions to knowledge, organised literature review that explains the concept of nanotechnology among other, theoretical review and some empirical findings. Research method which could be exploratory or literature search, findings and conclusion.</p> <p>Yes, most of the references are between 2018 and 2021. However, the author may include recent studies.</p> <p>Other observations The abstract should be written is such a manner that it captures the objective of the study, rationales for the study, research methodology, implications and contributions of the study, The introductory is too descriptive, it does not articulate what the author intend to dwell on. The literature review section should be organised. It should start with conceptual review of nanotechnology, its advances and application in agriculture, theoretical review that discusses the linkages between nanotechnology and agriculture performance, and any empirical literature. There should be research methodology section that discusses the approach the author wants to take to add to knowledge. It could be exploratory, literature search or others. This will yield some findings from which conclusions could be drawn. Lastly, the referencing style should consistent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, but there are some minor grammatical errors</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:	Oyeniran Ishola Wasiu
Department, University & Country	Nigerian Defence Academy, Nigeria