

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_118996</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ROLE OF NITROGEN IN WHEAT PRODUCTION SYSTEM AND NITROGEN FOR IMPROVING WHEAT YIELD AND QUALITY: A REVIEW</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> Yes, the review presents important information regarding the application of nitrogen to wheat cultivation, based on a large number of high-quality scientific articles.</p> <p><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> Yes, it is.</p> <p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> Yes. It is.</p> <p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> Yes, I do.</p> <p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> No, the number of references used is somewhat excessive considering the length (number of pages) of the review. Some references likely just reinforce what has already been presented in other articles, and the list could be reduced slightly, prioritizing the most recent and important ones.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, it is.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Include the meaning of the acronym NUE the first time it is mentioned in the abstract.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Ismarley Lage Horta Morais</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Uberlândia, Brazil</b>