

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Scientific Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JSRR_130696 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of nanocomposite on penetration and development of Meloidogyne incognita on okra. |
| Type of the Article | Original 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>

Review Form 3

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 manuscript is important for documenting and disseminating research findings allowing scientists to share knowledge. Nanocomposte may disrupt the movement and penetration of nematodes in Okra roots by altering soil propertoos or directly affecting nematode. Nanocomposte may interfere the life cycle stages of M. incognita reducing formation of root galls and egg production. Some nanocomposte induces resitants in plants, streghtening their defence mechanism against nematode attack. Tej manuscript will offer more sustainable approach with lower toxicity to non-target organisms. | Noted |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | Thanks |
| 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. | Yes, need minor modofocations as suggested in review. | Done |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | yes | Thanks |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | yes | Done |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, need some minor modifications. | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | The paper can be accepted after minro modifications. | ok |

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? | <u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u> | |