

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_83688
Title of the Manuscript:	Agronomic biofortification of zinc in wheat
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1.The Title of the review must be changed: Zinc biofortification in wheat(Triticum aestivum L.)</p> <p>2.Abstract Emerging countries must be changed to developing countries.</p> <p>3.Effect of biofortification : This needs Re - writing of most paragraphs. Further more, you must distinguish between soil applied zinc and foliar applied zinc. For example : Various workers have reported that growth of wheat plants improved with the supply of zinc at concentration of 10 - 20 mg kg-(- - - various workers) and so. You must not repeat. This is the way of writing a review article. You must use this procedure of writing to avoid repeaing the same statement again and again. This apply to the whole review. Stressors must be corrected to stresses, which include both biotic and Abiotic stresses.</p> <p>4.Conclusions It needs to be more informative, with regard to . future prospect of biofortification.</p> <p>Refs. The Refs are too many. They must be reduced to those directly related to the work. Pethaps half of such Refs must be deleted. Review of this type does not need so many Refs.</p>	Corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The review is good and worthy of publication.	Thank you

Review Form 1.6
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>	