ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:	
Date Manuscript Received: 29.01.2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 02.01.2017	
Manuscript Title: EFFECT OF HERBAGREEN NANO-PARTICLES ON BIOCHEMICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL PARAMETERS OF CEREALS (WHEAT AND CORN).		

ESJ Manuscript Number:

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

Questions	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]		
1. The title is clear and it is it is adequate to the content of the article.	4		
(a brief explanation is recommendable) The title "Effect of herbagreen nano-particles on biochemical and technological parameters of cereals (wheat and corn)" is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.			
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4		
(a brief explanation is recommendable)			
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results to the research study that intended to provide evidence and proof of the positive effects, that applying of the Bio-Fertilizer Herbagreen produced through nanotechnology has on the agriculture in Albania.			
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4		

(a brief explanation is recommendable)			
There are not grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.			
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4		
(a brief explanation is recommendable)			
The study methods are explained clearly, It was performed for two consecutive years on wheat and corn according to the randomized block scheme with 5 variants, four replications each.			
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.			
(a brief explanation is recommendable)			
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors			
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content	3		
content.	0		
(a brief explanation is recommendable)			
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content conc the highest level of proteins were reached in variant 3, technological parame component of proteins and applying of the Herbagreen fertilizers could avoid waters contamination caused by only traditional mineral fertilizers use.	erning the corn results, ter gluten as a d or reduce the soil and		
 (a brief explanation is recommendable) The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content conc the highest level of proteins were reached in variant 3, technological parame component of proteins and applying of the Herbagreen fertilizers could avoid waters contamination caused by only traditional mineral fertilizers use. 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. 	erning the corn results, ter gluten as a d or reduce the soil and 3		
 (a brief explanation is recommendable) The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content conc the highest level of proteins were reached in variant 3, technological parame component of proteins and applying of the Herbagreen fertilizers could avoid waters contamination caused by only traditional mineral fertilizers use. 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. (a brief explanation is recommendable) 	erning the corn results, ter gluten as a 1 or reduce the soil and 3		

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	Х
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This study intended to provide evidence and proof of the positive effects, that applying of the Bio-Fertilizer Herbagreen produced through nanotechnology has on the agriculture in Albania. The information presented strictly convey the message of the manuscript and the body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. Based on the experiments performed during two consecutive years on the selected crops of corn and wheat, it was noticed that in addition to a yield increase in the plots treated with this nanotechnology, there was also an increase in the gluten values in wheat, while regarding the percentage values of proteins and lipids it was noted that the values of the treated plots with Herbagreen had the same values of the plots treated with the maximal dosage of chemical fertilizers.





