

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
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 (Oryza sativa 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>
<b>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.</b>	Regarding the importance of the manuscript for the scientific community, this work presents a comprehensive study on the <b>The impact of foliar application of Nano-fertilizers on the productivity and health of the soil in rice transplants (Oryza sativa L.)</b> The detailed experimental setup, including the use of a randomized block design, a variety of treatment combinations, analysis methods, provides valuable insights into the practical benefits <b>The impact of foliar application of Nano-fertilizers</b> . Specifically, the findings demonstrate the superiority <b>of the impact of foliar application of Nano-fertilizers</b> , along with recommended doses of fertilizers, over control treatments and individual nutrient applications. However, the manuscript could be improved by including yield data a more detailed discussion on the mechanism behind the observed benefits <b>of the impact of foliar application of Nano-fertilizers</b> . Also, integrating a comparison of the economic benefits of these practices in terms of input costs versus yield improvement would provide a more holistic view of the practical implications for farmers.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the article <b>The impact of foliar application of Nano-fertilizers on the productivity and health of the soil in rice transplants (Oryza sativa L.)</b> is suitable and accurately reflects the main focus and findings of the study.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provided for the article outlines the basic structure of the study including its design, methodology, and a brief overview of the results. However, for it to be comprehensive and fully serve its purpose, there are several points that require addition or refinement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective clarification. The abstract starts by stating the title of the investigation but does not explicitly mention the primary objective of the study. It is crucial to briefly state the research question or objective to provide the reader with a clear understanding of the purpose of the study.</li> <li>2. Specific details on methodology. It lacks specificity regarding the key aspects of the methodology that directly relate to the study's scope. To improve the clarity and organization of the Material and Methods section, I recommend adding specific subsections such as "Experimental Site and Design," "Treatments," and "Data Collection and Analysis., Experimental details " These subsections will help structure the content more effectively and allow readers to follow the experimental procedures more easily.</li> <li>3. Results overview.To improve the clarity and organization of the result and discussion section, I recommend adding specific heading like <b>The impact of foliar application of Nano-fertilizers on grain yield etc.</b></li> <li>4. Conclusion and implications. A brief sentence summarizing the main conclusion and its potential implications for agricultural practices or future research would provide a more rounded and informative</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>The structure and subsections of the manuscript titled <b>The impact of foliar application of Nano-fertilizers on the productivity and health of the soil in rice transplants (Oryza sativa L.)</b> appear to follow a conventional scientific research article layout, including sections such as Abstract, Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. However, there are areas where the structure could be improved for better clarity and coherence. Here are specific suggestions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Subsection of Material and Methods: This section is detailed, covering the experimental design, treatments, and procedures. However, it would benefit from subsections for clarity, such as "Experimental Site and Design," "Treatments," and "Data Collection and Analysis." Subsections would help readers navigate through the information more effectively.</li> <li>2. Additional subsection for Results and Discussion: Integrating the discussion more closely with the results for each treatment, including comparisons with existing literature, would make the findings more impactful.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>RBD design enhances the reliability of the findings by minimizing the effects of confounding variables. The manuscript outlines a diverse range of treatments, including a control. The results and conclusions are supported by references to existing literature, indicating that the findings contribute to and align with the broader body of research in the field.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The references listed in the provided text are a mix of relatively recent and older studies, The references are not sufficient, and many of them are outdated.</p> <p>References not well written, and too old</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article provided demonstrate a level of proficiency that is generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are a few sections where the language could be refined to improve clarity and communication.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lack of objective:</b> The transition from the introduction to the methodology and from the results to the conclusion is abrupt. I suggest to end the introduction with a sentence that explicitly states the research question or objective.</li> <li>• <b>Lack of coherence between paragraphs:</b> There's a lack of coherence in how the results are presented, After presenting each <b>The impact of foliar application of Nano-fertilizers</b> results, add a summarizing sentence that links to the next section, highlighting the comparative importance or relationship between the INM studied.</li> <li>• <b>The explanation of treatment is too dense and hard to follow:</b> I suggest to introduce a table to list and describe the treatments.</li> <li>• <b>Lack of hypotheses and statistical test:</b> The "Material and Methods" section starts immediately with details of the experimental design without first outlining the specific objectives or hypotheses the study aims to test. To improve the clarity and organization of the Material and Methods section, I recommend adding specific subsections such as "Experimental Site and Design," "Treatments," and "Data Collection and Analysis., Experimental details</li> <li>• <b>Limitations:</b> I recommend that the discussion section include a more detailed consideration of the limitations of the study. For instance, it would be valuable to address the generalizability of the findings, particularly in relation to different climatic conditions that were not represented by the study site.</li> </ul> <p><b>The manuscript is publishable after effecting all the corrections indicated.</b></p> <p><b>PLEASE CHECK ATTACHMENT</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Suryakant Kakasaheb Ugile</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>V.N.M.K.V, India</b></p>