

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_128895
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Nanotechnology for the management of plant-parasitic nematodes
Type of the Article	Review 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a significant contribution to the scientific community by exploring the application of nanotechnology for the management of plant-parasitic nematodes (PPNs). It addresses critical agricultural challenges posed by PPNS, highlighting the limitations of conventional chemical pesticides and offering eco-friendly, innovative alternatives in the form of nanoparticles. By detailing the mode of action, efficacy, and preparation methods of various nanoparticles, the review advances understanding in nanomaterial-based pest control.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, " Application of Nanotechnology for the Management of Plant-Parasitic Nematodes ," is clear and adequately conveys the central theme of the article.	
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.	The abstract effectively conveys the focus of the article on utilizing nanotechnology to manage plant-parasitic nematodes (PPNs). However, it can be enhanced for greater comprehensiveness and clarity.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Based on the content provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically accurate and well-researched, with a clear focus on the application of nanotechnology in managing plant-parasitic nematodes (PPNs). The use of multiple references and detailed explanations of the mechanisms, types of nanoparticles, and their preparation methods indicate thorough research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references included in the manuscript appear to be extensive and cover a wide range of studies relevant to the topic, including the application, synthesis, and mechanisms of nanoparticles for plant-parasitic nematode (PPN) management.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it uses scientific terminology and formal phrasing appropriate for an academic audience. However, there are areas where clarity, grammar, and flow could be improved to enhance readability and professionalism.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zaheen Hasan
Department, University & Country	M.L.K.(P.G.) College, India