

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122019
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nano urea on leaf nutrients and some quality parameters of tea (<i>Camellia sinensis</i> (L) O. Kuntze)
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>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript 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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Dear Editor</p> <p>First of all thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the manuscript titled "Effect of nano urea on leaf nutrients and some quality parameters of tea (Camellia sinensis (L) O. Kuntze)". Following are my comments:</p> <p>Authors are studying the effect of usage of "Nano Urea" on the some of the quality parameters of tea quality. This study is interesting and has been done many other countries also for different crops. But there is major scope of improvement in the current manuscript including writing, methodology, discussion etc. Some of the major points are mentioned below:</p> <p>Point 1: Methodology of the experiments is not clear. E.g. "The total caffeine in fresh tea leaves was calculated in percentage. By taking weight of crude caffeine and weight of fresh leaves in gram, the amount of caffeine was calculated."</p> <p>Which instrument has been used for the same? What was the extraction procedure?</p> <p>Point 2: There is no explanation for Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig.3 rather these figures look similar to Table 1. But the data range is different, reason is not clear.</p> <p>Point 3: Authors claim "In the experiment it was found that application of Nano Urea showed significant impact on the total caffeine content of tea leaf" However, caffeine has been increased by 0.133% only which doesn't seems significant to until unless supported by some other references. "The impact of Nano Urea on total polyphenol (%) on tea leaves was found to be non-significant." However, there is 4% rise on application of nano urea. These points shall be clarified in the manuscript along with proper justification.</p> <p>Point 4: Manuscript lacks in its structure also, its not clear. E.g. Section 3 in Results. How these numbers have been assigned. It should be corrected. Small grammatical mistakes, spelling errors should also be rechecked.</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>Anupma Sharma</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>CSIR-Central Scientific Instruments Organisation, Panjab University, India</p>