

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123777
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Nano-Zn, Inorganic, and Organic Nutrient Management Practices and Their Impact on Nutrient Availability in Kharif Maize (Zea mays L.)
Type of the Article	Original research article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
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.	The present work is useful to the community and is well conducted. However, the authors have directly correlated the foliar application of nutrients with their soil availability which is inappropriate. Foliar application of nano Zn triggers several biochemical reactions in plant and enhances uptake of NPK from soil. But, soil nutrient availability may not be directly affected. Hence, the authors should have focussed on foliar application and uptake changes studies instead.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, suitable	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, appropriate	
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.	The manuscript adopted suitable methodology with ideal objectives and the results were comprehensively discussed. However, discussion on how foliar application can alter nutrient availability in soil was lacking.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references were not presented as per the journal's format and therefore tis section needs major revision. Most of the references were very old and so it is suggested to add some more recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, suitable	
Optional/General comments	The article may be revised by detailing how foliar application directly impacted soilnutrient availability or may instead focus on uptake studies SEE ATTACHMENT	

Review Form 3

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:	P. Bindu Priya
Department, University & Country	Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, India