

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129636
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Effects of Neem-Coated Urea, Agrotain Urea and Nano Nitrogen on Nutrient Uptake by Paddy Crop
Type of the Article	Research

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>

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.	The nutrient imbalance causes the reduction of crop yield. Hence, its management is necessary to increase the global food grains production. In this line this study attempted to integrate the use of traditional fertilizers with innovative nitrogen formulations in rice which is needed at this time.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, a little modification is needed. Comparative Effects of Neem-Coated Urea, Agrotain Urea and Nano Nitrogen on Nutrient Uptake of Paddy Crop	
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.	No, a little modification is needed as suggested. Mention the number of replications and delete the treatments in study design	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. But the results are not properly discussed. Discussion part needs to be improved. Please mention the possible reasons for your result than supporting with other published references. Table for yield is missing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references are older than 5 years. Hence, the recent references such as Sandeep et al (2024) (Sandeep, S.N., Fathima, P.S., Yogananda, S.B., Suma, R., Shivakumar, K.V. and Sowmyalatha, B.S., Effect of Rice Cultivation Practices and Nitrogen Management strategies on Growth and Yield Attributes in Rice under Rice-cowpea Cropping System.), Anushka et al. (2023), (Anushka. AS, Kumar, G.S., Sritharan, N., Radhamani, S. and Maragatham, S., 2023. Studies on the Effect of Nano-Urea on Growth, Yield and Nutrient Use Efficiency in	

Review Form 3

	Transplanted Rice. International Journal of Environment and Climate Change, 13(10), pp.1547-1554.) can be added.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is suitable for quality scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript may be accepted for the publication once the comments are addressed.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Senthamil E</u>
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	<u>University of Agricultural Sciences, India</u>