

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_121463
Title of the Manuscript:	Stimulatory effect of ZnO nanoparticles as a nanofertilizer on growth and yield of pearl millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i>)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>This manuscript makes a valuable contribution to the emerging field of nanofertilizers and provides actionable insights for improving pearl millet cultivation. The findings have potential implications for enhancing food security and agricultural sustainability.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>This title is generally suitable as it accurately reflects the main focus and findings of the study. However, to make it more concise and potentially more impactful, a slight modification could be considered: "ZnO nanoparticles as nanofertilizer enhance growth and yield of pearl millet (Pennisetum glaucum)"</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 is generally comprehensive and provides a good overview of the study. However, there are a few areas where it could be improved for clarity and completeness:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specify the range of nano ZnO concentrations tested (200-600 ppm) to give readers a clearer idea of the experimental setup. 2. Provide some quantitative results. For example, include the percentage increase in yield or specific yield values for the best-performing treatment compared to the control. 3. Mention the economic aspect, as this was an important part of the study (e.g., "The treatment also resulted in the highest net return"). 4. Consider adding a brief concluding sentence that explicitly states the potential of nano ZnO as a fertilizer for pearl millet. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The overall structure follows a standard scientific paper format, which is appropriate. However, there are some areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add a subsection in the Methods detailing the statistical analysis procedures used. 2. Add a subsection in Methods describing how growth parameters, yield, and economic data were collected and measured. 3. Add a "Future Directions" subsection in the Conclusion to suggest areas for further research. 	
<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>The manuscript demonstrates several aspects of scientific robustness and technical soundness. However, to further enhance the scientific robustness, the manuscript would benefit from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More detailed description of the statistical analysis procedures in the methods section. 2. Clearer emphasis on statistical significance in the results discussion. 3. A more in-depth discussion of potential mechanisms underlying the observed effects of nano ZnO. 4. Improvements of the tables such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adding letter superscripts (a, b, c, etc.) to the data values would clearly indicate which treatments are significantly different from each other. b. A footnote explaining the meaning of the superscripts should be added (e.g., "Values followed by the same letter within a column are not significantly different at $p < 0.05$"). c. Standardize the number of decimal places for each parameter to improve readability. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References from the year 2010 can be updated.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Areas needing improvement:</p> <p>For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. "may diseases attack on crops" should be "may reduce disease attack on crops" a intricate interplay" should be "an intricate interplay"2. Many sentences are overly long and complex, making them difficult to follow.3. Some sentences lack proper punctuation or conjunction use.4. Some explanations are wordy and could be more concise.5. There's inconsistent use of tenses, particularly in the methods and results sections.6. The writing sometimes lacks the precision and objectivity expected in scientific communications.7. There are occasional typographical errors (e.g., "p. llant" instead of "plant").8. Inconsistent formatting of scientific names (should be italicized throughout).	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are side comments on the manuscript file need to be addressed</p>	

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>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:

Name:	Albino Taer
Department, University & Country	Surigao del Norte State University, Philippines