

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111061
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Influence of Nano Urea on the Growth, and Yield of Irrigated Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) crop.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 1. Yes, the manuscript looks good, and presenting some novel idea. 2. The title needs to be revised as it looks like old model as used by so many authors such statements in the title. 3. Yes, abstract is well documented, but there is the lack of explaining nano nitrogen. 4. If possible, reduce the introduction section, it looks to longer for a paper. 5. There is missing in discussion part, as the author only discuss “our results are same with et al., etc. What the authors results just put that. Don,t use such irrelevant things in scientific world, as so many authors, viewers will look through your paper for citing etc. Discussion needs major revision. 6. I think the references are not much to support the results, as there are only one mentioned in so many cases to support author results.	Noted
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammarly needs to be checked	
Optional/General comments	Major revision in discussion section is required. I don't recommend the paper at this condition. The references are cited manually without following any format.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) No	