

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_116469
Title of the Manuscript:	Zn-CHECK: Revolutionizing Plant Nutrition with Amino Acid-Based Zinc Chelation
Type of the Article	Original Research Papers

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes. I think that Zinc is an interesting nutrient to study. Since it is a micronutrient, it does not receive so much exploration like that of macronutrients (e.g. NPK). The added impact of this study lies on the analysis of the behavior of their innovation to alkaline soils, which is impressive. I believe that this study could go far, especially when it comes to the technology development and commercialization.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes! It is concise and it communicates the study.	Noted
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes, however, the researchers, could include their numerical results to the abstract to further improve them. For example, mention the amount of biomass compared to the control, and so on.	Noted
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure and subsections are appropriate and comprehensive. However, I have the following suggestions that you could consider to further improve your manuscript: METHODOLOGY Section 2.4. Pot Trials. <i>In this study, Pak choi, a leafy vegetable, was employed as the test subject.</i> It would be better if there is a separate section on "Plant Material" where you can explain the crop, discuss the source of your plant sample, then also define if it is grown from seed, or it was already on the vegetative stage when it was used in the experiment. Add a section on how you analyzed the results statistically. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS Clarification: Is the data on Table 4, statistically significant? Did you perform ANOVA? If yes, kindly indicate the significant difference you obtained through the post-hoc analysis.	Noted
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes.	

Review Form 1.7

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Yes, I think that the language used in this article is satisfactory and communicates the message clearly.</p> <p>Some notes on the technicalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use a consistent presentation of capitalization. For example, decide if you are going to use “chlorophyll a” or “Chlorophyll A” throughout your manuscript. • Check the capitalization of phrases in subtitles. For instance, “Estimation of Chlorophyll and plant biomass content” for uniformity should be: “Estimation of Chlorophyll and Plant Biomass Content”. • Be consistent in presenting Zn-Check. Throughout the article, choose if you are going to present it as “Zn-CHECK” like what is in the title, or Zinc check or Zinc-Check. But I suggest to use how you present it in the title. 	
Optional/General comments	None.	

PART 2:

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