

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126171
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing growth and zinc bioavailability in rice (Oryza sativa L.) cultivars through agronomic biofortification
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I don't like this manuscript because the data table is not present how can I review the result. No sequence number found on tables and some traits data is missing.	Thank you, sir, for your constructive and critical comments The manuscript has been modified accordingly. The data table has been combined and presented.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Enhancing Growth and Zinc Enrichment in Rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) Cultivars through Innovative Agronomic Biofortification Strategies	The title has been modified in response to the reviewer's feedback. We have retained the term 'bioavailability' as it signifies the role of Zn in human nutrition. We kindly request the reviewer's consideration.
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	You need to work out more on this manuscript.	We have addressed each comment in detail and made necessary improvements to ensure the manuscript meet the expected standard.
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	If the result data set is not present so, how can I say that this manuscript is scientific and technically sounded.	Table has been revised and combined as per the reviewer's suggestion to enhance the clarity.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Add more refernces.	32 references have been added in response to your suggestion
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to be more polished.	We have undertaken a through review of the manuscript. Edits were made to improve the readability.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Need to more work.	We acknowledge that additional work is necessary and are committed for making necessary improvements. We have highlighted all the corrections made by us. We attempted to address the comments thoroughly.

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>	No