

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100290
Title of the Manuscript:	ROLE OF NANO NITROGEN IN INCREASING YIELD OF MAIZE (Zea mays L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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)	Yes, valuable information about the nano nitrogen fertilization in maize Need to be revised yes One year study, in the introduction Not given the findings of the previous studies conducted on maize crop related nano nitrogen fertilizer. Treatments not mentioned properly. Lacking agronomic practices like time of sowing, spacing, irrigation, date harvesting etc. Also give the procedure of observation recorded. Results not discussed in sequence. Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	It's good given latest references. There is need to improve the manuscript. It will be better publishing as short communication because one year study and one treatment gave the best results SO IT SHOULD PUBLISHED.	

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Avtar Singh Bimbraw
Department, University & Country	Punjab Agricultural University, India