

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116828
Title of the Manuscript:	Unlocking Nutritional Potential: Multi-OMICS Strategies for Enhancing Millet Nutritional Traits
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Here, the authors explore the application of multi-OMICS (genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, metabolomics, and phenomics) strategies to enhance the nutritional traits of millet grains. By integrating comprehensive molecular datasets, we aim to elucidate the genetic and biochemical pathways governing key nutritional attributes such as protein content, amino acid composition, micronutrient density, and antioxidant capacity in millets. The work described in the manuscript of sufficient novelty, quality, and potential significance to warrant publication, the provided methods sufficient for an interested reader to reproduce the results and the conclusions adequately supported by the data presented. So, the publication is recommended after revision:</p> <p>Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction should be clarified in terms of uniqueness and advantage what is the novelty of this work over the previous related work. 2. Figures/Tables should stand alone and therefore, their respective captions should effectively describe them. Please improve the captions in general. For insensate, abbreviations should be defined regardless of the fact that they have been defined in the text too. 3. Data Reproducibility: The study would benefit from providing more information on the reproducibility of the results, such as conducting replicate experiments or addressing potential variability in the experimental setup. This would enhance the reliability of the reported findings. 4. How many parallel experiments did you make? Are the results the only ones or means or what? 5. The experimental conditions for the removal process must be listed with the captions of Figures and Tables. 6. More profound discussions and comparisons with other published works are welcomed. 7. The Manuscript needs thorough revision to improve the text quality and readability of work. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khalid Z. Elwakeel
Department, University & Country	Port Said University, Egypt