

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125465
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Nano Urea on Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i> L.) Grafts Cv. Alphonso.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Regarding the importance of the manuscript for the scientific community, this work presents a comprehensive study on the Effect of Nano Urea on Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i> L.) Grafts Cv .Alphonso. The detailed experimental setup, including the use of a randomized block design, a variety of treatment combinations, analysis methods, provides valuable insights into the practical benefits nano urea. Specifically, the findings demonstrate the superiority of foliar spray and drenching of nano urea components , over control treatments and individual nano urea applications. However, the manuscript could be improved by including more detailed discussion on the mechanism behind the observed effect of foliar spray and drenching of nano urea . Also, integrating a comparison of the economic benefits of these practices in terms of input costs in the view of the practical implications for farmers.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article Effect of Nano Urea on Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i> L.) Grafts Cv .Alphonso. is suitable and accurately reflects the main focus and findings of the study.The abstract and the results section confirm that the study specifically examines the effect of foliar spray and drenching of nano urea treatment, making the title appropriate and directly relevant to the content of the article.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provided for the article outlines the basic structure of the study including its design, methodology, and a brief overview of the results. However, for it to be comprehensive and fully serve its purpose, there are several points that require addition or refinement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objective clarification: The abstract starts by stating the title of the investigation but does not explicitly mention the primary objective of the study. It is crucial to briefly state the research question or objective to provide the reader with a clear understanding of the purpose of the study. 2. Introduction : It lacks specificity regarding I recommend adding some more and current reviews 3. Specific details on methodology: It lacks specificity regarding the key aspects of the methodology that directly relate to the study's scope. These subsections will help structure the content more effectively and allow readers to follow the experimental procedures more easily. 4. Results overview: To improve the clarity and organization of the result and discussion section, I recommend adding specific tables in heading including treatments details. 5. Conclusion and implications: A brief sentence summarizing the main conclusion and its potential implications for agricultural practices or future research would provide a more rounded and informative 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure and subsections of the manuscript titled Effect of Nano Urea on Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i> L.) appear to follow a conventional scientific research article layout, including sections such as Abstract, Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. However, there are areas where the structure could be improved for better clarity and coherence. Here are specific suggestions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subsection of Material and Methods: This section is detailed, covering the experimental design, treatments, and procedures. Subsections would help readers navigate through the information more effectively. 2. Additional subsection for Results and Discussion: Integrating the discussion more closely with the results for each treatment, including comparisons with existing literature, would make the findings more impactful. 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>RBD design enhances the reliability of the findings by minimizing the effects of confounding variables. The manuscript outlines a diverse range of treatments, including a control. The results and conclusions are supported by references to existing literature, indicating that the findings contribute to and align with the broader body of research in the field.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references listed in the provided text are a mix of relatively recent and older studies, The references are not sufficient, and many of them are outdated.</p> <p>References not well written, and too old</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article provided demonstrate a level of proficiency that is generally suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of objective: I suggest ending the introduction with a sentence that explicitly states the research question or objective. • Lack of coherence between paragraphs: There's a lack of coherence in how the results are presented, After presenting each results, add a summarizing sentence that links to the next section, highlighting the comparative importance or relationship between the studied. • The explanation of treatment is too dense and hard to follow: I suggest introducing a table to list and describing the treatments. • Limitations: I recommend that the discussion section include a more detailed consideration of the limitations of the study. <p>The manuscript is publishable after effecting all the corrections indicated.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Suryakant Kakasaheb Ugile</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>V.N.M.K.V, India</p>