

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	JournalofAdvancesinBiology&Biotechnology
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JABB_123607
Titleof theManuscript:	InfluenceofFoliarApplicationofNitrogenThroughUreaandNanoUreaonMorphophysiologicalandYieldinFoftailMillet(Setariaitalical.)
Typeof the Article	OriginalResearchArticle

PART1:ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISIONcomments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpartinthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedbackhere)
Pleasewriteafew sentencesregardingtheimportance ofthismanuscriptforthescientificcommunity.Whydo youlike(ordislike)thismanuscript?Aminimumof3-4 sentencesmayberequiredforthispart.	The subject (topic) of this manuscript is significant. In this manuscript eight treatments were applied (including control) to investigate the impact of foliar spray on Foxtail millet in enhancing morpho-physiological parameters like, plant height (cm), Day to 50% flowering, Day to maturity, RGR and CGR, yield and yield contributing characters like, Number of panicles hill ⁻¹ , Panicle length (cm), No. of spikelet panicle ⁻¹ , Grain yield kg plot ⁻¹ , Grain yield kg ha ⁻¹ , Harvest Index (%) and B:C ratio.	
Isthe title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, title of the article seems to be suitable.	
Isthe 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 too small and little elaboration is suggested.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	More or less acceptable; little formatting in alignment of the numbering in different sections & subsections is needed.	
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 analyzes the effects of foliar spray on Foxtail millet by applying eight treatments, including a control, using nanourea to enhance morpho-physiological parameters such as plant height (cm), Day to 50% flowering, Day to maturity, rapid growth rate (RGR) and continuous growth rate (CGR), yield, and yield contributing characteristics such as number of panicles hill ⁻¹ , panicle length (cm), number of spikelet panicle ⁻¹ , grain yield kg plot ⁻¹ , grain yield kg ha ⁻¹ , harvest index (%), and B:C ratio.	

ReviewForm3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>It would be better if few more recent and relevant references are added to it. References are not arranged in proper and uniform style in some places. <i>For instance</i>, (a) In Ref. No. 1, instead of colon, one comma is given after the Volume No. and one space to be given after the Volume No.;</p> <p>(b) Similarly in Ref No. 3, Volume No. is written in bold & one extra space is also given after it which is not matching with that of the other references given.</p> <p>(c) In Ref, no. 7, <i>The Author citation for Eleusine coracana</i>, "L. Gaertn" should not be written in italics & further, one space is required in between the journal name.</p> <p>(d) In Ref. No. 10, Journal's Volume No. is written in Bold.</p> <p>(e) In Ref. No. 17, one space is required before the page number and after the colon.</p> <p>(f) One space is required before the year (2019) in Ref. No. 2.</p> <p>. The subject (topic) of this manuscript is significant.</p> <p>2. Title seems to be suitable.</p> <p>3. Abstract is too small and little elaboration is suggested.</p>	
--	--	--

ReviewForm3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In my opinion, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications provided the plagiarized sentences are needed to be rewritten correctly.	
Optional/General comments	<u>In many places (excluding ABSTRACT) this manuscript suffers serious plagiarism issues and should be checked with plagiarism checking tools after rewriting the problematic areas before republication of this article.</u>	

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:	Sujoy Kumar Sen
Department, University & Country	Siliguri College, University of North Bengal, India