

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_101798
Title of the Manuscript:	Biofortification: A promising solution for combating micronutrient deficiencies and enhancing human health
Type of the Article	Minireview papers

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://journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The article presents relevant and current issues, presenting strategies, especially biofortification to combat micronutrient deficiencies in the population, The title of the article is suitable. The objective of the manuscript is not clear. Is it to raise reflection on the subject? It is necessary to clarify the objectives and how the manuscript contributes to the theme within science. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. The article needs to be better structured. The manuscript is scientifically correct. The references is not sufficient. Throughout the entire text of the manuscript, only two bibliographic citations appear. What were the sources of the information presented in the text? The article does not show sufficient details of the methods. How was the data collected? What methodological system was used? Results need to be discussed critically. The authors recognize the advantages of biofortification, but what are the disadvantages and uncertainties? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Larissa da Cunha Feio Costa
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal da Fronteira Sul, Brazil