

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_124086
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Impact of Nano-Fertilizers on Growth-attributing characteristics in Transplanted Hybrid Rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the use of nano-fertilizers, an emerging technology that offers enhanced nutrient efficiency and reduced environmental impact. By focusing on transplanted hybrid rice, a critical staple crop, the study addresses both food security and sustainable agricultural practices. The findings contribute valuable insights into how nano-fertilizers can influence growth-attributing characteristics, potentially revolutionizing traditional fertilization methods	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "The Impact of Nano-Fertilizers on Growth-Attributing Characteristics in Transplanted Hybrid Rice ( <i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)," is generally clear but could be made more concise and focused. A suggested alternative: "Effects of Nano-Fertilizers on Growth Characteristics of Transplanted Hybrid Rice ( <i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)" This revised title removes redundancy and makes it more direct, while still emphasizing the focus on nano-fertilizers and hybrid rice.	
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.	The abstract is generally informative but can be improved for clarity, conciseness, and structure. Some suggestions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clearly state the aim and importance of the study at the beginning of the abstract. Explain why studying nano-fertilizers in hybrid rice is significant.</li> <li>2. The level of detail on the experimental design is a bit too much for an abstract. You can briefly mention the treatments and emphasize the key comparisons rather than listing all the treatments.</li> <li>3. Highlight the key findings more clearly, particularly in terms of the growth-attributing characteristics and yield. Mention how the results contribute to the field.</li> <li>4. A concluding sentence summarizing the practical implications of your findings should be added.</li> </ol>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Almost correct	
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.	This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound as it follows a well-established experimental design (Randomized Block Design with three replications), which is suitable for agronomic studies. The inclusion of multiple treatments allows for comprehensive comparisons between different levels of nano-fertilizer and nitrogen application, enhancing the reliability of the results. Additionally, the study spans two consecutive Kharif seasons, providing a temporal dimension that strengthens the validity of the findings. The detailed measurements of growth parameters and grain yield further indicate thorough data collection, making the conclusions drawn from this research credible and applicable to broader agricultural practices.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please include more recent references to better justify your results with detailed comparisons.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are generally acceptable for scholarly communication. However, some minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing need to be addressed for better clarity and flow. A thorough proofreading would improve the overall readability and professionalism of the manuscript. Don't use abbreviation write full foam of work.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### **PART 2:**

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Nazia Baloch</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sindh Agriculture University, Pakistan</b>