

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current International Research Archives</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_129018
Manuscript Title:	Application of Nanotechnology in Agriculture: Opportunities and Challenges
Article Type	Review Articles

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states just that **NO** Manuscripts should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. To find out a complete guide to the Peer Review process, reviewers are asked to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Concerning Peer Review**

Peer Review Comment 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: Comment**

	<b>Reviewer comments</b>	<b>Author Input</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight the section in the manuscript. The author is obliged to write his response here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences about the importance of this manuscript to the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this section.</b>	Nanotechnology is extraordinary engineering to achieve efficiency. In the agricultural sector, nanotechnology is something new and is still being researched further because of the potential risks, of course this is a challenge that is not easy as well as an extraordinary opportunity. The application of ETHICS and further research into nanotechnology is the best solution for sustainability.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Application of Nanotechnology in Agriculture: Opportunities and Challenges in the Context of Environmental Sustainability</b>	
<b>Is the article abstract comprehensive? Would you suggest adding (or removing) some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is quite detailed, but it is too long and exceeds 250 words. If possible, the author can condense the abstract section again by removing sentences that may be related to other sentences, but still summarize the main contents of the article being presented.	
<b>Is the text scientifically correct? Please write here.</b>	<b>Scientifically, the format for drafting a manuscript has not been found and it is best to avoid subsections.</b> <b>Generally, scientific texts contain:</b> <b>Background</b> <b>Review the Library (if needed)</b> <b>Methodology (way)</b> <b>Results and Discussion</b> <b>Conclusion</b> <b>Reference</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and up to date? If you have additional reference suggestions, please indicate them in the review form.</b>	If you look at the number of pages in the manuscript, the number of references contained in the categories is sufficient, but it would be good if the references were further enriched as insight for writers and readers. Overall, the reference sources are quite updated.	
<b>Is the quality of the article in Bahasa/English suitable for scientific communication?</b>	In general, the English language contained in the communication is easy to understand.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comment	Look again at the sections in the manuscript and it is a good idea to make the sections in a scientific manuscript general.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eddy Silamat</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pat Petulai University, Indonesia</b>