

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_96382</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Agronomic Zn Biofortification of Cereal Crops a Sustainable Way to Ensuring Nutritional Security: A Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. 'Functions vis-à-vis deficiency symptoms of Zn in plant system' & 'Factors affecting Zn deficiency in plant system' are not relevant enough with the objective of present manuscript. 5. Manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. Most of the references are recent. In "Global status of Zn deficiency" very old (2006) literature has been cited; Countries with highest population of Zn deficiency (recent data is much more acceptable).	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Language is suitable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Ananya Ghosh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sister Nivedita University, India</b>