

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_123239
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation the Effect of Urea and Nanourea on Rainfed Bt Cotton (<i>Gossypium hirsutum</i> L.) Growth in the Marathwada Region of Maharashtra, India
Type of the Article	Research

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Cotton an important crop for the country, earns foreign exchange. Understanding the growth pattern and its influence under varied environment in terms of phenotyping is crucial for its recommendation to a particular geographical area. Suitability decides the yielding ability. Hence, such experiments need to be carried out. Such notes may be incorporated in the introduction	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. the title may be rewritten as follows Evaluation of the effect of Urea and Nanourea on growth pattern of rainfed Cotton (<i>Gossypium hirsutum</i> L.) To be incorporated in 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.	Abstract should bring the highlighting points like maximum values for a parameter. Comparison may be drawn between application of different modes of application of fertilizers May be written at the end of each parameter and the same written in abridged form in the conclusion	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Sub section on yield should be incorporated To be added in results column	
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.	As stated in the suggestions of the author, experimental variables need to be analyzed with a suitable statistical design. In crop physiology experiments, which have time series and continuous variables, data analysis has to be done separately for dates of sampling. Data should not be compared across the columns like 30,45, 60 DAS. RBD can be practiced and in no case split plot design should be applied RBD data to be added at the end of each table and interpreted	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Only one recent reference is incorporated. References pertaining to yield and fertilizer may be added. New references to be added in the end of the text	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Text and language can be improved Corrections in the form of track changes have been notified in the text	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript may be revised with suitable statistical interpretation Graphical representation may be made for some parameters like NAR	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramesh Thatikunta
Department, University & Country	PJ TSAU, India