

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_123122
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF NANO UREA ON GROWTH, YIELD AND NUTRIENT UPTAKE OF FINGER MILLET (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> 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.	Nitrogen use efficiency is higher in nano urea than conventional urea and also nitrogen is very low therefore selection of research problem is good	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Authors studied the combined effect of soil Nitrogen levels and foliar spray of nano urea. So the title may be modified	
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, authors are requested to include post harvest soil nutrient availability in abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Interaction effect to be included in results and discussion	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The importance of use of nano urea than conventional urea may be discussed more in introduction. Some more justification needed in discussion. Accordingly reference to be included	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract : Post harvest available nutrients status to included in abstract Introduction : background of the research problem may be improved Materials and methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Recommended fertilizer schedule to be included. ➤ Authors are requested to clarify Why absolute control was maintained outside the layout instead of including it in main and subplot. ➤ Authors are requested to mentioned number of seeds sown per hole and plant to plant distance either 30 cm x 10 cm or 30 cm x 15 cm. ➤ In nutrient uptake formula Biomass may be given as dry matter production in order to maintain uniformity. <p>Results and discussion Authors are requested to include interaction effect between N levels and foliar spray for all the parameters and may give proper justification</p> <p>Stage or time of biometric observations to be included in MM and in tables.</p> <p>The experiment was conducted at field level but DMP was given as g plant⁻¹. It may be given as kg ha⁻¹.</p> <p>Authors are requested to mention why nano urea surpassed over conventional urea spray.</p> <p>Authors are requested to clarify about nutrient uptake and nutrient availability in nano urea. How nano urea enhanced the soil nutrient availability.</p> <p>Conclusion In the results, 100 % RND and nano urea @ 4 ml L⁻¹ recorded higher values for growth, yield, uptake and availability. But it differs in Conclusion, Kindly clarify or modify</p>	

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:	S. Jawahar
Department, University & Country	Dr.M.S.Swaminathan Agricultural College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India