

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ JSRR_115853
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of Nano Urea and Urea Foliar Sprays on Nutrient Uptake and Soil Fertility in Fodder Maize (Zea mays L.) Production
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p> <p>In the Materials and Methods section, it is suggested that the 'field layout' of the experiment be presented graphically to substantially support the RCBD design and be further discussed. Moreover, the treatments should also be identified in the 'field layout', to show the 'relative randomness of the block'. ANOVA was also presented and results of these should also be presented in the Results and Discussion.</p> <p>In the Results and Discussion, specific to Figure 1, 2 and 3 and Table 1, 2 and 3 , there were only 11 treatments presented, contrary to what is presented in the abstract as "thirteen treatments replicated thrice". Which to my limited understanding RCBD is a 'block' of experimental treatments at random layout, so I am assuming there is a minor inconsistency of what was presented and should be corrected.</p>	Corrected
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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