

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127935
Title of the Manuscript:	“The impact of foliar application of Nano-fertilizers on the productivity and health of the soil in rice transplants (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)”
Type of the Article	

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 addresses a critical and timely topic in sustainable agriculture by exploring the impact of foliar-applied nano-fertilizers on rice productivity and soil health. As global food security depends heavily on rice production, innovative strategies like nano-fertilization offer the potential to enhance nutrient use efficiency, reduce environmental degradation, and maintain soil vitality. The findings contribute valuable insights into the interaction between advanced fertilization technologies and agroecosystems, paving the way for more sustainable and efficient rice cultivation practices. This work is particularly relevant for researchers, agronomists, and policymakers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is informative, but it could be revised slightly to improve clarity and conciseness. The phrase <i>"productivity and health of the soil"</i> might be interpreted ambiguously. Consider specifying what aspect of soil health is being studied (e.g., microbial activity, nutrient content).	
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 clear and provides an adequate summary of the study, although some minor edits for conciseness and clarity could enhance readability.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The article appears to be scientifically sound and aligns with established principles in agronomy and soil science regarding the application of nano-fertilizers, which have been shown to enhance nutrient efficiency, crop yield, and soil health through controlled and targeted nutrient delivery.</p> <p>The introduction part contextualizes the significance of rice cultivation globally and regionally, emphasizing the need for innovative practices like nano-fertilizers to optimize productivity and sustainability.</p> <p>The materials and methods section outlines a well-structured experimental design, adhering to standard scientific procedures with clear parameters.</p> <p>The results section and discussion are poorly written and is not very descriptive. It needs a thorough revision and the discussion is absolutely poorly written and authors have not discussed their findings with other workers. So, this section is strictly advised to redrafted with proper discussion. These findings are consistent with prior research cited in the article, reinforcing the credibility of the study.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are very less and lacking of latest work. So, authors are requested to please add the recent references in introduction and discussion.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article is generally clear and contains pertinent scientific information. However, it would benefit from significant editing to improve readability, structure, and adherence to scholarly standards. Below are some observations: Language and Grammar: There are numerous grammatical errors and awkward sentence constructions, such as "First and primary" (should be "First and foremost") and "Reported similar results" (should be "Similar results were reported"). Consistency in Terminology: The use of terms like "highest" and "lowest" is repetitive and can be presented more concisely. Similarly, terms such as "grain & straw" need consistent formatting.	
Optional/General comments	Overall the manuscript is of significance and is suitable for publication after revision and corrections as suggested. I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer. No, there is no ethical issue involved in the manuscript.	

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:	Anil Kumar Sharma
Department, University & Country	School of Agriculture, Uttarakhand University, India