

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
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

Compulsory 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.	
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	
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.	
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.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Add more refernces.	
Minor REVISION comments	Need to be more polished.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Need to more work.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arun Kumar
Department, University & Country	Banda University Of Agriculture And Technology, India