Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_116934**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of nano zinc and nano iron on the growth of guava (Psidium guajava L.) cv. Allahabad Safeda**
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.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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	The writers were unable to address the research objectives issue because there are no longer any modes of action that are well supported by graphics. Furthermore, the discussion that began was absolutely meaningless and disorganized. Your conclusion lacked clarity and was poorly written, with both grammatical and spelling mistakes. The earliest sources were also cited in this work to support the writers' opinions and different points of view (the list of references is insufficient and out-of-date). Additionally disregarded the guidelines for good research writing.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Very bad	
Optional/General comments	Despite the potential of the manuscript to be impactful in the field, the write-up, experimental work and corresponding discussion lack adequate depth and the conclusions made are not adequately supported by experimental evidence. The lack of appropriate controls make comparison difficult. Below are some specific comments: • The abstract lacks flow and cohesion in terms of the structure and organization of the information provided. Therefore, the abstract requires significant improvements. • What is the overall implication or significance of the findings of this work. • The whole manuscript requires extensive language editing to improve its clarity and readability. As it is, one struggles to get the message properly. • The introduction can be improved by capturing what makes your materials ideal to couple and what is the contribution/role of each component of nano zinc and nano iron on the growth of guava. • Some of the evaluations in the experimental part are inaccurate and need to be revised. • Further work is needed on the standardization of representation production. • nanoparticles characterizations of nanoparticles, and SEM images of the composite must be compared to appropriate controls, and EDX patterns and elemental mapping must be provided. Apart from the average particle size, there is no other information from TEM in terms of the internal microstructure of the individual materials vs the composite, and high-resolution images and SAED patterns. No electrochemical characterisation and XPS analysis.	

	• The discussion section lacks structure, depth and any convincing arguments supported by adequate experimental evidence. • An in-depth understanding and discussion of the charge generation and transfer is missing, along with the corresponding the nanocomposite. • mode of actions needs to be examined. Free radical quenching experiments do not adequately account for the major role of hydroxyl radicals, should be supplemented to better illustrate • Some critical experiments are missing, such as the effect of pH, organic and inorganic matter, etc on vegetative parameters. • There is no convincing evidence of the degradation of the of each component of nano zinc and nano iron in the guava cells. • Please provide an explanation for your manuscript's lack of figures. • In order to give the discussion meaning, there are sufficient and suitable control samples. • In this manuscript, the overall article structure, the experiment lacks sufficient data support, and I think it needs a major revision. • The writing of the manuscript needs to be further enhanced with linguistic embellishments where necessary.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Shahira H. EL-Moslamy**
Department, University & Country	**Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute (GEBRI), City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications (SRTA-city), Egypt**