

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129020
Title of the Manuscript:	Carbon-Based Nanomaterials for Soil Amendment: A Paradigm Shift in Agriculture Practices
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.	Carbon-based nanomaterials (CBNMs) represent a significant advancement in soil amendment strategies, offering enhanced sustainability and efficiency in agricultural practices. These materials, such as graphene and carbon nanotubes, possess unique physicochemical properties, including high surface area, chemical stability, and tunable functionality, which improve soil structure, water retention, and nutrient availability. Moreover, CBNMs can mitigate environmental challenges by reducing the overuse of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, thereby promoting eco-friendly agriculture. This paradigm shift underscores the potential of nanotechnology to address global food security while preserving soil health and biodiversity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is quite appropriate.	
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 is comprehensive and well-written.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the article is well organized and well written.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, references are not enough for a review article and more articles should be read and be sited in the article. Also, please use updated and recent papers in the literature review to give more sense to the reader. Please also site the following articles: Kalashgrani, M. Y., Nejad, F. F., & Rahmanian, V. (2022). Carbon quantum dots platforms: as nano therapeutic for biomedical applications. <i>Advances in Applied NanoBio-Technologies</i> , 38-42.; Moradi, S., Babapoor, A., Ghanbarlou, S., Kalashgarani, M. Y., Salahshoori, I., & Seyfaee, A. (2024). Toward a new generation of fertilizers with the approach of controlled-release fertilizers: a review. <i>Journal of Coatings Technology and Research</i> , 21(1), 31-54.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Authors should carefully revise and corrected all the grammatical issues and follow the scientific norms in the whole manuscript. Please check the main text to improve the English level.	
Optional/General comments	Authors need to read more relevant papers that are highly cited or published in high-quality journals and make more in-depth discussions or comments. In addition to the text, the article also needs quality and up-to-date figures and tables, and this article lacks appropriate and quality figures and tables. The authors claimed that this Review on Carbon-Based Nanomaterials for Soil Amendment: A Paradigm Shift in Agriculture Practices. This Review is well organized and written, but the following points in the article should be corrected for publication: 1) Authors should carefully revise and correct all the grammatical issues and follow the scientific norms in the whole manuscript. Please check the main text to improve your English level. 2) Please use updated and recent papers in the literature review to give more sense to the reader. 3) Authors need to read more relevant papers that are highly cited or published in high-quality journals and make more in-depth discussions or comments. 4) In addition to the text, the article also needs quality and up-to-date figures and tables, and this article lacks appropriate and quality figures and tables.	

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:	Masoomeh Yari Kalashgrani
Department, University & Country	Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran