

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_126612
Title of the Manuscript:	ZINC DYNAMICS IN SOIL, TRANSPORTATION AND ASSIMILATION IN PLANTS
Type of the Article	Review Article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is very important as a reference study for the scientific community especially for other researchers interested in studying the nutritional needs of plants. It explains the importance of zinc for plants, the risks resulting from a deficiency of this element in the soil and thus on plants and humans, and its causes, and how to increase the plant's benefit from the zinc element available in the soil and its absorption.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but I prefer that the title contains the words (reference study) so that the reader knows that from the title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Fairly good, but the subsections in the manuscript could be better formatted and numbered.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, Because it follows the scientific research method in writing the manuscript, and presents the sections of the manuscript; the abstract, introduction, results, and discussion, in a sound scientific and technical manner.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Good article. There are some points, I have pointed out some words in the manuscript that I suggest be corrected. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Raeda Salah
Department, University & Country	Tishreen University, Syria