

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103382
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRIENT CONTENT, UPTAKE, QUALITY OF BIOFORTIFIED PEARL MILLET [Pennisetum glaucum (L.) R. Br.] AND FERTILITY STATUS OF SOIL AS INFLUENCED BY FERTILIZATION OF POTASSIUM AND ZINC
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Biofortification is the process by which the nutritional quality of food crops is improved through agronomic practices, conventional plant breeding or modern biotechnology which is scientifically proven to be a sustainable and cost-effective approach to address malnutrition like Fe and Zn deficiencies. This is done to conquer malnutrition in the community.</p> <p>2. Suitable</p> <p>3. Rewrite including the following, research gap, probable solution, aims, objectives, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion and recommendations' in brief!</p> <p>4. Correct, there is need to improve grammar, and the conclusion is not up to standard. See comment.</p> <p>5. Correct</p> <p>6. Add up-to 20</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Need massive improvement	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The conclusions need expansion. See comment	

[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:	Shumba Tobias Takawira
Department, University & Country	Harare Polytechnic, Zimbabwe